The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 7, 1890.

The Week.

On Saturday last the two Kansas Senators (Ingalls and Plumb) and one Nebraska Senator (Paddock) voted in favor of Senator Vest's amendment to reduce duties on plain and decorated china and crockeryware by 10 per cent., *i. e.*, from 50 and 60 per cent. to 40 and 50 per cent. ad valorem. The vote stood yeas 17, nays 20, all the yeas being Democrats except the three Senators named, and all the nays being Republicans. This was the first break in the Republican column in the Senate on the McKinley Bill. Although there have been premonitions of revolt in Kansas before, this is the only real outbreak. It is all the more significant since Senator Ingalls's term is about to expire, the Legislature elected this fall choosing his successor. Simultaneously with this "kick" the news comes that the Seventh District Republican Convention of Kansas has adopted a platform endorsing Mr. Blaine's reciprocity views, favoring such *reduction* (not revision) of the tariff as shall "cheapen the products of the factory and shop in ratio with cheapened farm products," and congratulating the Kansas Senators on the bold and patriotic stand they have taken upon financial and other questions of special importance to the West. Still more significant was a resolution absolving the nominee of the Convention "from dictation of the party caucus *upon all economic issues.*" "We bid him," says the resolution, "enter the halls of Congress *a free man*, to battle for the material and business interests as well as the moral and political welfare of this great State." This is, perhaps, the most wholesome send-off that any nominee for Congress has had since the close of the war. We recall nothing so refreshing in the annals of either party. We set it down to the credit of the Republicans of the Seventh Kansas District that if they have not made an epoch in our political life, they have at least shown how one ought to be made by emancipating the Congressman from the dictation of the party caucus as to measures of policy—a dictation crushing and stifling to individuality, and therefore deadening to all political progress.

Equally decisive is the change of base which the Atchison *Champion* announces in its issue of July 31. The *Champion* is an old and stanch Republican paper, founded by John A. Martin, one of the "wheel horses" of the party in Kansas. The *Champion* says that for thirty years it has advocated and defended the protective-tariff policy, but that it has found that the practical effects of that policy have been disastrous to the West and to the agricultural communities. It has at last discovered that the tariff is an invention for making the cultivators of the soil pay tribute to the manufacturers, increasing the profits of the latter and lessening the earnings of the former. "These facts," it says, "have induced the *Champion* at this time to make public its conviction that a protective tariff is one of the many things the West does not want and cannot afford to sustain. The Western farmer has no interest whatever in a protective tariff. His interest rather lies in the direction of free trade—of access to all markets—wherever his products may be in demand."

Senator Plumb came very near letting the cat out of the bag when, in discussing the McKinley Tariff Bill, he said:

"It looks to me a good deal as though some persons interested in the rate of duties had said: 'We do not care what the effect is upon the revenues—that is not our concern, nor our responsibility; some Congress has got to meet that, and in the meantime we want the pound of flesh.' *I will not say the pound of flesh nominated in the bond, because there was no bond;* but they want the benefit of the opportunity to be created, and they have succeeded in getting it, whereby their profits will be enhanced—I will not say anything now about the resulting benefit to the country—but whereby their profits will be enhanced; and it is a very awkward condition of things, a very injurious condition of things, that has been brought about to the country."

What kind of a bond did the Senator have in his mind when he said that the pound of flesh was not nominated in it? He meant the kind of bond that *Shylock* exhibited to the judge when he demanded the pound of flesh, a bond that could be enforced by law, a bond with a seal on it that could not be railed off by any amount of talk. Barring these external formalities, what the Senator meant to say was that certain persons and corporations put up a definite sum of money to elect Harrison, on the promise of Quay and Wanamaker that they should have an indefinite number of pounds of flesh out of the American people, and that it makes no difference to them whether the result is a deficit in the National Treasury or not. Probably the only man in public life who does not know this is Senator Morrill of Vermont. It is always well to have a deacon in the partnership for any occasion of prime rascality.

The speech of Senator Teller of Colorado on Monday settles in the negative the question as to whether "Tom" Reed can make the Senate change its rules in order to rush through the McKinley Bill and the Force Bill. Mr. Blair having read an editorial article of the muzzled New York *Tribune* protesting against the discussion of the Tariff Bill, Mr. Teller declared that he did not share in the view that there had been any unnecessary delay in the discussion of the bill, or that the Senate was recreant because it did not proceed more rapidly. He said that he "did not propose to be frightened into any haste or expedition in the discharge of his duty on the bill," and gave these unanswerable reasons for his position: "He had learned that hasty legislation was bad legislation, and he had learned that any bill which deserved to become a law would stand the test of discussion and examination. The impatience, the impetuosity with which the Senate was asked to take hold of the bill and pass it was, to him, somewhat disgusting. He was in full sympathy with the purpose of the bill, which he understood to be to raise duties wherever they were found to be too low, and to lower them wherever they were found to be too high. He wished to say that, so far as he (Teller) was concerned, the present rules of the Senate had been sufficient for the discharge of the duties of the Senate in an orderly and decent manner, and he was prepared to resist vigorously and as efficiently as he could any change of the rules for the purpose of hastening the passage of the Tariff Bill or any other bill." Mr. Plumb announced his adhesion to these views, and Mr. Edmunds and a number of other Republican Senators are known to share them, so that it may now be accepted as settled that the rules will not be changed and that the Senate will remain a deliberative body. When the "Tom" Reed balloon has collapsed, as it is already evident will happen before long, the public will look back with amazement upon the impudence of his now happily defeated attempt to suppress free discussion in the Congress of the United States.

There was an interesting debate in the Senate on Monday on the St. Mary's Ship Canal, and some uncomplimentary remarks were made about the failure of the House to pass the bill for making a new canal at that place. Such remarks were, indeed, unparliamentary, as Senator Ingalls and Senator Edmunds said, but no regret need be felt on that account. The House, under the despotism of Speaker Reed, has given its energies to the passage of a tariff bill to transfer the earnings of the people from A to B and from B to C in such a way as Mr. Wm. McKinley, jr., thinks they ought to be divided, and a bill to distribute seats in Congress in the way that Mr. H. C. Lodge thinks that they ought to be distributed. Consequently, it has had no time to think about the St. Mary's Canal or a good many other things of real public concern. The fact that this waterway passes more tonnage during the months that it is free from ice than the Suez Canal, and that this tremendous traffic depends upon a single lift lock, which is overworked and liable to get out of order at any time, has been lost sight of in the scramble for private pelf and in settling such questions as whether the Borax Company shall have the right to tax the public 3 cents per pound or only 2¾ cents. In the midst of this interesting wrangle comes the news that the St. Mary's lock has given way, and that the resulting loss to commerce is $100,000 per day. Then there is a mighty stir, and it is suddenly remembered that a bill to provide a new canal has been slumbering on the Speaker's table several months. Of course this bill could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not meet the present exigency, but it serves to point a moral and adorn one day's debate in the Senate.

Mr. Halstead, viewing the political field from the lofty point of Brooklyn, says that in the Republican family quarrel over the McKinley Bill, "public opinion is with Mr. Blaine, and the public admiration for him never was so great as now." This being the case, how does it happen that the McKinley Bill has any chance of becoming a law? Why does not public opinion have any effect upon the Republican majority in Congress? Furthermore, if Mr. Blaine has "public opinion" and "public admiration" on his side, what will be the result in the Congressional elections of November if the party in Congress refuses to follow Mr. Blaine's lead? We sincerely hope that Mr. Halstead is sound in his estimate of Mr. Blaine's party strength, for the greater his following now, the larger will be his influence for good upon the country. He never was in a better position for usefulness than he is at present, and he has seldom, during his long career, held a position more completely in the public interest.

The leaders of the Republican party in Tennessee were confronted at their Convention last week with the question as to what attitude the party should take towards the Force Bill. The success of the Farmers' Alliance in capturing control of the recent Democratic Convention had disgusted many members of this party and inclined them to support the Republicans if the Convention of the latter party should not repel them. Lewis T. Baxter, who was the unopposed choice of the delegates as a candidate for Governor, and who is an excellent type of the progressive business men whom the party needs in order to win, had announced his firm opposition to any endorsement of the Force Bill, as he maintained that he could not hope to carry the State if such legislation should be favored. The question was, then, whether to ignore the matter entirely, as the Republican State Conventions in Minnesota and Nebraska did, or to insert a perfunctory and deprecatory reference to the subject. The latter course was finally chosen by the Platform Committee, whose resolution characterized the Lodge Bill as "a law that would unsettle the business interests," and expressed confidence that the Republican party has wisdom and patriotism enough not to pass such a law.

Two hopeful signs as to the treatment of the negro question by the Constitutional Convention soon to assemble in Mississippi are found in recent utterances by two prominent representatives of the race. G. H. Oliver, a colored Republican member of the last Legislature, delivered a speech at Jonestown a few days ago, in which he said that his legislative experience had taught him that the white Democrats are the true friends of the negro, and that, if the Constitutional Convention should be composed of the same material as the last Legislature, the interests of the colored people would be respected and protected. Isaiah T. Montgomery, a leading negro of Mound Bayou, Miss., has just written an interesting and intelligent letter to a North Carolina correspondent as to the condition of his race in the Delta region, whither so many have gone from North Carolina. In conclusion he refers to the Constitutional Convention, and draws this encouraging picture of the situation: "There has been considerable apprehension on the part of our people that changes will be effected in the organic law of the State dangerous to their rights and liberties. Until very recently I have shared largely in that apprehension. Constant discussion through the press has to some extent aroused the people to the importance of the weighty matters to be considered and adjusted, which must be done under the restrictions or guarantees of the Constitution of the United States, and the guarantees subscribed to by this State upon her readmission to the Union, all of which combine to form a hedge of protection to citizenship which cannot be easily invaded. The delegates to the Convention will generally be of the ablest and most practical class, and, judging from the most available information, I have now reached the conclusion that the approaching assembly will endeavor to promote the general interests of the State, and honestly begin a solution of the difficulties which have so long hindered her progress. In this settlement I hope for a better understanding between the races; there will certainly be a strong element in the Convention anxious to promote that end and fully restore political liberty to all classes."

Another hopeful sign is to be found in the report of a mass-meeting by the Republicans of Issaquena County just before the election for members of the Convention to decide upon their action. Issaquena is a county where the blacks outnumber the whites about twelve to one, the census of 1880 showing 9,174 negroes to only 826 whites, and the preponderance of the colored race being even greater now. The Democrats had nominated Capt. W. S. Farish for member of the Convention, and the question was whether the Republicans should put up a candidate against him. S. B. Blackwell, a former member of the Legislature, and W. E. Mallison, another prominent Republican, both made speeches advising no party nomination. Mr. Mallison declared his belief that "it would be better to allow white men to make unmolested the Constitution which is to take the place of the one which it is claimed was framed by alien hands, and then, if failure and mortification result, they would have themselves to blame." Moreover, so far as the Republicans of Issaquena County were concerned, Capt. Farish, the Democratic candidate, "entertained views which were acceptable to nearly every one, and possessed the ability to see that his views are presented with eloquence and force." Capt. Farish was called on for an expression of his views, and responded in a conservative, able speech, promising that his efforts should be directed towards the betterment of the condition of all his constituents, white and black. He was warmly applauded, and at the conclusion of his speech a resolution was adopted declaring it the sense of the meeting that no Republican nomination be made, and expressing confidence in the ability and integrity of Capt. Farish as the delegate.

At the very time that the Philadelphia *Press* is publishing the protests of colored Republicans in the South against the passage of the Force Bill, the colored Republicans of its own city are taking organized action in the same direction. The Matthew Stanley Quay Club, composed entirely of colored men, with a prominent local politician as President, held a largely attended meeting on Sunday, and passed unanimously resolutions to the effect that the pending Federal Election Bill is not practical and will not help the political condition of the colored men in the South, but will rather have a tendency to keep alive race prejudices, and therefore expressing the hope that the bill will not become a law. In view of such developments it is not strange that the advocates of the Force Bill should be losing confidence in its passage.

In the course of surplus-smashing at Washington nearly everybody has forgotten the Direct Tax Refunding Bill, which caused such fury in the House two years ago. The bill appropriates about $20,000,000 to the States for the direct war tax of 1861-2. In the last Congress it was passed by the Senate. When it reached the House a few men filibustered against it in a desperate way. There was a large majority in favor of passing it, but Speaker Reed's new rules had not been adopted. So it became necessary to effect a compromise with the filibusters, by the terms of which the measure went over to the December session. The December session came and went without action on the bill, and at the end of the session, which was the end of the Fiftieth Congress, the bill died. Early in the present session the bill was again passed by the Senate. It went to the House, where Speaker Reed's new rules are ample to prevent filibustering. Why has it not been passed? Are the surplus-killers satisfied that they can get rid of all the money in the Treasury without shovelling out $20,000,000 at one scoop? It would seem so. It would seem also that there are some reasons (in this case not less than twenty millions) for allowing the minority some freedom of resistance to unjust measures.

In the discussions of the public finances, both in Congress and in the press, nothing is more common than the suggestion that the sinking fund can be suspended at any time in case there should be a prospect of a deficit; but nobody except the late Senator Beck has had the courage to introduce a bill to suspend it. It has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been said, with entire truth, that the retirement of the public debt has overpassed the requirements of the sinking fund by some $700,000,000. It has been argued with much force that the reason for the sinking fund has ceased to exist. That reason was in the nature of an assurance to the public creditors that the Government would steadily reduce the principal of the debt, and thus give greater confidence to capitalists that the whole would be paid. If there ever was any doubt on this score in the circles of finance, the doubt was long since removed. But nobody seems to be ambitious of the distinction of repealing the sinking fund. Why there should be so much encouragement to our neighbors to take the glorious step, and so little eagerness to take it ourselves, is, however, easily explained. For some years the public mind has been filled with distressing tales of the surplus. How to get rid of the everlasting surplus has been the problem of one administration after another, and all eyes have been turned with a sense of relief to the $109,000,000 of 4½ per cent. bonds that mature on the first of September, 1891. Here, we have said to each other, is our great opportunity. If we can only screw along till September, 1891, we can put this whole odious surplus where it will do the most good. But if we now repeal the sinking fund we acknowledge not only that the surplus has vanished, but that we shall not be able to meet the bagatelle of 4½ per cents when they fall due. It is not a very proud distinction to any public man to be the first in making such an avowal.

The Georgia farmers seem to have gone daft on the subject of public schools, and at present refuse any just appropriation to their State University, utterly oblivious of the fact that they are thus cutting themselves off from any but miserably inefficient teachers for their public schools. The work of the University of Georgia has been about on a par with that of other State universities of the South, barring Virginia. The best citizens of Georgia, however, have recently waked up to the absolute necessity of a finer quality of higher education, and the result has been a reorganization of the University on thoroughly progressive principles, with the view of doing true university work just as soon as there is any demand for it in Georgia, and with the view, meanwhile, of striving energetically to create the demand. The right spirit undoubtedly prevails at the University, and there are many encouraging signs of a strong foundation throughout the State for the aspirations of the new school. For the present, however, the professors and fellows must largely work out their own destiny in the midst of discouraging but far from hopeless ignorance.

What is perhaps the first official characterization of the Pan-American Congress by a foreign nation participating in it is found in the message of President Balmaceda to the Chilian Congress, at the opening of its sessions on June 1. He said that the invitation to send delegates to the Congress had been accepted by Chili "more out of polite regard for a friendly Government than in the hope of obtaining immediate and positive advantages for both Americas." Of the practical matters before the International Conference, the one in which Chili had the deepest interest, namely, the question of a common silver coin, was left with nothing done, says the President, coolly ignoring, as he well may, the recommendation for a new gathering, next year, to attack the hopeless problem. The steps taken to secure better communication by land and water President Balmaceda regards as only provisional, and as leaving wholly unsettled some of the most difficult and puzzling questions connected with the subject. The attitude of Chili towards the famous arbitration project is thus set forth: "We did not give in our adherence to it, both because we believed it without efficacy, and because Chili does not need for the exercise of her sovereignty in the civilized world any other law than the general law of nations. Peoples like ourselves, who live by their industry, and faithfully live up to their international agreements and obligations, will have occasion to resort to arbitration in the particular and concrete cases in which such a course is suggested by public justice, prudence, and the reciprocal regard of sovereign States. But I deem it unlawful for us to limit the liberty of action of coming generations in vindicating their rights by the means authorized by international law, in emergencies in which it is for them alone to decide upon the proper course." After this, it will hardly be considered feasible to secure Chili's acceptance of Pan-American arbitration.

The commercial relations of Austria-Hungary with the United States are both relatively and absolutely unimportant: of a total of $745,000,000 of imports in 1889, only $7,642,297, or but a trifle over 1 per cent., came from Austria, while of $730,000,000 of exports, that country received only $720,815, one-tenth of 1 per cent. In the import list Austria stands No. 19, being outstripped by such countries as the Sandwich Islands, the Philippine Islands, Mexico, and Venezuela, to say nothing of Switzerland, China, and Japan; in the export list she ranks No. 33, or next to the lowest. A careful review of the conditions indicated by these statistics is found in the last annual report of the Austrian Consulate-General at New York, which points out that there are a few articles in which Austria takes the lead, the chief of them being pearl and other buttons, with which she supplied us last year to the amount of $1,352,241, or 43 per cent. of our total importation, against 23 per cent. from Germany, 25 per cent. from France, and 7 per cent. from England. In hollow and crystal glassware she was also ahead of all competing nations, the business amounting to $719,000, 31 per cent. of the total. Two articles of commerce which are popularly supposed to come here in large quantities are imported to an amount which bears a small proportion to the actual sales of them in our markets. The class of small leather wares technically known as "Vienna articles" really consists of poor American imitations of imported samples, and the Consul warns his countrymen against filling small sample orders from unknown importers. Then, again, much of the so-called Tokay sold here is of California manufacture, and it is stated that a self-styled importing house, widely known through its profuse advertising, and mentioned by name in the report, sold 1,200 dozen bottles of "Tokay" in 1887 without passing a single invoice through the Custom-house during the year.

The statistics of the tonnage of foreign merchant navies for 1888, which have only recently been gathered and published by the British Board of Trade, do not afford much encouragement to the ship-subsidy hunters either in this country or in Europe; for they prove that during the year in question—the returns for 1889 not being yet accessible—there were only three countries which did not show a decrease in their ocean mercantile tonnage, and these were the United Kingdom, Norway, and Denmark—the three countries which do not pay bounties to their shipping. Thus, in the case of the German Empire, the total shows a decline of fully 15,000 tons, and in the case of France of 10,500 tons, while for Great Britain the increase for the same period was 131,462 tons.

Mr. Goschen, the Chancellor of the English Exchequer, informed Parliament a few days ago that three celebrated pictures, one by Holbein, one by Velasquez, and one by Moroni, the property of Lord Radnor, had been purchased for the nation for the sum of £55,000, of which £30,000 had been furnished by private subscription and the balance by the Government. The pictures, if not so purchased, would have been taken to the Continent and lost to the United Kingdom. Now, suppose that $150,000 had been subscribed by private persons for the purpose of bringing these works of art to the United States, and that the Government had been asked to furnish the remainder, what would the answer have been? It would have been, first, in the negative, and here nobody could have rightly complained. But that would not have been the whole answer. It would have been replied, "If you gentlemen raise $150,000 for this purpose, we (the Government of the United States) will tax you $45,000 for the privilege of bringing the pictures into the country, and at the same rate for any larger sum you may raise. If you put up the whole amount, we will tax you $79,500, so that what costs any foreign country $265,000 for purposes of embellishment and education shall cost this country $344,500." This would be the enlightened answer that the public-spirited citizens would receive at the hands of the Senate Committee on Finance, which is now paying its campaign debts in pounds of flesh taken indiscriminately from the American people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FOLLY OF THE FORCE BILL.

THE Philadelphia *Press* has done a service to the public by sending a correspondent on a tour of the South to interview prominent men of both parties as to the Force Bill. Several of his letters have already been published, and the objections to the policy which he quotes from the lips of leading Republicans, both white and black, are conclusive as to the folly of the scheme. Some of these deliverances are so striking that they deserve a wide circulation.

Beginning with Virginia, the *Press* correspondent talked with United States District-Attorney Bristow of the Danville District, who pointed out two fatal objections to the Lodge Bill. One is the fact that the law can be called into operation in any district only by the petition of certain voters, and that, in any district where Democrats hold a large share of the power, these petitioners "will be ostracized and boycotted, socially and in business. If they are negroes working for Democratic employers, they will be discharged." The second objection is the fact that the success of the law will depend on the character of the men who are selected to enforce it in the voting precincts. Mr. Bristow says that "they must possess discretion, coolness, courage, and intelligence," and then adds: "I regret to say it, but there is a lack of men of this character in the Republican party in the South who would be willing to sacrifice themselves as inspectors." Moreover, as to the chief supervisors and the district supervisors, Mr. Bristow declares that "if they are men of intelligence and standing, they will be wined and dined and patronized for the purpose of influencing them until it will be almost impossible for them to withstand the pressure."

W. H. Pleasants of Danville, who is described as "a very intelligent and conservative colored man, and the recognized leader of his people in Pittsylvania County," and who is also Chairman of the Republican Committee, presents a most cogent argument against the Force Bill, considered from the way in which it would affect his race. "The present law," he says, "is a farce, and it will be far better for my race to go on under the existing law, though it is a dead letter, than to have a new one enacted which will become only partially operative after it has cost innocent lives and disturbed all our social conditions." That such would be the inevitable effect of the Lodge Bill he proceeds to show as follows: "There are very few white men of prominence in this State belonging to the Republican party who would care to have it known that they asked, in accordance with the provisions of the Lodge Bill, to have the law enforced. Who, then, must compose the fifty or one hundred men who will petition for its enforcement? My people, the negroes; and with what result? Every man of them, the instant he makes that demand, might just as well pack up his little worldly all and leave the district, never to return. His employment would be taken from him and his personal safety menaced. Ever after every one of the fifty would be a marked man. I see another perplexing problem that will operate against my people. Nine-tenths of the employers of colored labor are white Democrats. If the colored men declined to vote as they directed, they would be deprived of work."

Going on to Raleigh, the *Press* correspondent found leading Republicans of North Carolina equally clear and emphatic in showing the hopelessness of expecting any good result from the Lodge Bill. Thomas R. Purnell of Raleigh, an ex-Confederate, who has supported the Republican party since the war, and who has been repeatedly a candidate on its State ticket, says flatly that "the trouble with the proposed law is that it cannot be enforced." The following forcible statement is quoted as being made by "a business man of Raleigh who declined to permit the use of his name," but whose first vote was cast for Abraham Lincoln in Philadelphia, and who is still a Republican: "I don't believe the Lodge Bill could be enforced here. We've got enough Federal law now to compel honest elections if it was enforced, but it is not, and the same will be true of the new election law."

A. W. Shaffer, for many years Chief Supervisor of Elections under the present Federal law, after showing that the existing law cannot be enforced because public sentiment does not sustain it, declares without reservation that the proposed law would only make things worse. "The Lodge Bill, with its supervisory machinery," he says, "offers no possible remedy or mitigation of the evils of such a condition. Such laws are injurious, because (1) they are totally inadequate to remedy the evil complained of; (2) they embitter its adversaries and make more intolerable the bitter life of its helpless victims; (3) they put afar off the possibility of any effective legislation while the silly experiment is undergoing trial."

Daniel L. Russell is one of the most prominent Republicans in North Carolina. He has supported the party ever since the war and has been elected by it to a seat in the Legislature, a judgeship of the Superior Court, and a place in the House of Representatives at Washington. He says of himself that he was born on a plantation and is identified in interest and blood with the South. "We know," he says, "that the pending Election Bill cannot be enforced generally in the South," and he adds: "The bill invites, indeed creates, dangerous friction between Federal and State authority. Conflicts will arise at every turn in registration, casting, counting, and certification of votes. If the bill could be so enforced as to give the right of suffrage to Southern Republicans in Congressional elections, the result would be that they would also vote and their votes be counted in State elections held at the same time and place and by the same officers. Democrats say this would be 'negro rule,' and as to the cotton States such is the truth. Such a result, as everybody ought to know, cannot be accomplished by anything short of an army with martial law and some battles, and this men call war."

It is to be hoped that the *Press* will send its correspondent throughout the South, because nothing can do so much to weaken the Force Bill as the unanswerable arguments against its passage which he is drawing forth from the most prominent Southern Republicans of both races. All of these deliverances only lend weight to the cogent argument against the whole Force Bill policy which President Harrison presented in his Senate speech of March 3, 1886, regarding the condition of the Southern negroes, and which cannot be too frequently quoted:

> "I have looked hopefully in the old times to the forcible intervention of the General Government in their defence. I have thought that it might be possible, under that stringent legislation which Congress adopted, by the forcible intervention of the Federal authority, to protect them in those rights of which they were so cruelly deprived. But I have ceased to have faith in the possibility of that intervention in their behalf, constituted as this Government is, with its complex organization of Federal and State governments, independent within certain limitations. In the States, and in the tribunals which they establish, and in the venue where the offences are committed, crimes against the colored people must be tried. Of necessity the successful vindication of the rights of these people fails unless there is a sentiment in the locality where the offences are to be examined into and punished that reprobates and condemns them."

Just as in the President's own State there is law enough to prevent White Cap outrages, and yet White Cap outrages occur, and the Attorney-General declares that "before there can be a successful prosecution there must be a considerable change in public sentiment," so in the South, as one of the Raleigh Republicans puts it, "we've got enough Federal Law now to compel honest elections if it was enforced"; but it is not enforced, and no law will be enforced until, in Mr. Harrison's words, "there is a sentiment in the locality where the offences are to be examined into and punished that reprobates and condemns them." Instead of developing such a public sentiment, the Force Bill, as Southern Republicans themselves testify, would only increase the bitterness of the whites against the blacks.

SPEAKER REED'S REPLY.

THE reply of Speaker Reed to X. M. C. in the *North American Review* for August is comprised in nine pages, which seem to be inadequate space for an answer to the twenty-two pages of pretty solid matter of the article entitled "Speaker Reed's Error" in the July number. But if he had nothing better to say than appears in the nine pages, certainly more space would have been superfluous. The principal point made by X. M. C. was that the Constitution requires a two-thirds majority to overcome a Presidential veto, and also requires that the vote shall be by yeas and nays. The same instrument says that a majority of members of either house shall constitute a quorum. The President is a part of the law-making power and the whole of the law-executing power. He must know what laws are in force. As to all that are signed by him the evidence of his own signature is sufficient. As to all that have become laws by remaining in his hands ten days, Congress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being then in continuous session, the fact that they have been in his hands during that time is something within his own knowledge. As to those that he has vetoed, how is he to know whether they have become laws or not? The contention of X. M. C. is that under the Constitution the only evidence he can *be obliged to accept* is a list of yeas and nays, which when taken together amount to a quorum, *i. e.*, a majority of each house. If he chooses to accept anything else, as, for example, the certificate of the Clerk of the House that there was a quorum present, although none was shown by the yeas and nays—that is one thing. But if he happens to feel considerable interest in the matter pending, as he usually does when he vetoes a bill, and if he says that no constitutional evidence has been shown to him of the presence of a quorum, where do we stand? Has the bill become a law or not? This is the principal point that Mr. Reed was concerned to answer. His answer is in these words:

"The author says the President's veto cannot be overruled except by a quorum actually voting. Why? Because, he says, 'the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays.' Yeas and nays must certainly show each vote of each member. Each member's vote must be determined by yeas and nays. But there is no applicability of this provision to that entirely different question whether either house is in condition for doing business by having a quorum present. What the House votes is one thing, what it is is another. The Constitution prescribes how the vote shall be determined; the rules made under the Constitution prescribe how the presence of a quorum shall be determined. Whatever business is done is done by a competent body; and if that body, properly constituted, acquiesces in the result arrived at by its members who do vote, what shock is there either to common sense, business sense, or constitutional law?"

Then he refers to certain decisions of the courts of Maine and New Hampshire touching quorums in State Legislatures and in boards of aldermen, and to a precedent made by Gov. Hill in New York, all of which would require a more precise and extended statement of facts than is here given to establish a condition of parallelism.

It is to be observed that Mr. Reed does not here touch the point made by X. M. C., which was that the President, being a coordinate branch of Government, could not be bound by the rules of the House. To say that "whatever business is done is done by a competent body" is irrelevant, because the House cannot enforce its competency beyond its own doors. The Constitution can enforce the competency of the House anywhere within the limits of the United States, and of course upon the President. According to Mr. Reed's argument, if the President should veto a bill and it should come back to him showing that upon reconsideration two members had voted to pass it and one member had voted not to pass it, but with a certificate from the clerk that a quorum was present when the vote was taken, not only does the bill become a law, but the President is bound to think so. We have supposed in this case that three members have actually voted, but that is a superfluity under the Reed conception. Two members would be quite sufficient if both voted in the affirmative. Indeed, why would not one suffice if his vote were in the affirmative? Is not a unanimous vote stronger than a two-thirds vote? The Constitution says: "If, after reconsideration, *two-thirds of that House* shall agree to pass the bill," etc. Is it possible to conceive that two members voting to pass the bill, and not more than one member voting the other way, should fill the constitutional requirement of "two-thirds of that House" provided only that a clerk's certificate is appended that a quorum was present when the vote was taken? If two votes would not answer the purpose, why should any less number than a quorum suffice?

The conclusion of the Speaker's reply is a trifle hysterical. He says that the "error" imputed to him by X. M. C., and which he is asked to correct,

"was the error of the Speaker just twenty-six hours. Then it became the error of the House of Representatives. *It has since become the error of the Republican party and of the people of the United States.* It had previously been the 'error' of the State Supreme Courts. Whatever may be the strength, wisdom, or bravery of the Speaker, he has never thought himself strong enough, wise enough, or brave enough to correct an 'error' of that kind and of those dimensions."

Such loose talk does not belong to the realm of sober discussion. It is pure rant and blather. The people of the United States have taken no action upon the subject: they have had no opportunity to do so. The Republican party has taken no action upon it, and cannot do so until the next National Convention meets. All that can be said about the House of Representatives is that the majority, having elected Mr. Reed for Speaker, followed his lead in the adoption of the new rule for counting a quorum. The next House may discard it—most probably will. The designation of the rule by X. M. C. as "Speaker Reed's error" was therefore entirely justified.

THE PENNSYLVANIA CAMPAIGN.

THE unique character of the political campaign in Pennsylvania this year attracts the attention of the whole country to the contest in that State. It is unique because its main object, on the Republican side, is to provide a vindication for one of the United States Senators from Pennsylvania against the charge that he is a public thief—the charge that, when holding an important State office, he robbed the State Treasury to further his private speculations. While he allowed that charge to remain unanswered, the Republican State Convention permitted him to dictate the State ticket, and gave him a personal certificate of confidence in its platform, putting up, moreover, as its candidate for Governor a man accused, by a fellow-Republican of responsibility and character, of grievous political crimes. It is natural, therefore, that people in all parts of the country and of all party affiliations should take great interest in the question, Will Quay get a vindication at the polls?

There would be little risk in answering this question in the negative if the answer were to be given in any other State but Pennsylvania under the same circumstances. American citizens are very careful about the personal honesty of their rulers. Nothing causes greater apprehension to the managers of political campaigns than the possibility of the springing of some charge against a candidate late in the canvass, when there is not time to give the reply an equal circulation. Such a charge as has for months been standing against Quay would defeat any Presidential candidate, and, we think, a State candidate almost anywhere in this country, if it was not fully met before election day. We find, however, that there is a general impression that the Pennsylvania conscience is of a different make. Quay's supreme audacity in dictating the ticket and the platform seems to many persons to indicate that he is so sure of his control of the political machinery of his State and of the fidelity of the Republican voters there to their party name that he counts with reason on a victory. It is interesting to look over the ground and see how the chances at this date lie.

The first reason that a Quay man will give for his confidence this year is the fact that the Republicans have the majority of about 80,000 given to Harrison to rely on. It is easy to show that this is not a safe reliance even in Pennsylvania. In the first place, the shape given to the campaign of 1888 by President Cleveland's tariff-reform message was especially calculated to strengthen the Republicans in Pennsylvania, the nerve-centre of protection, where even the Democratic leader, Mr. Randall, was a tariff man. The majority of 1888 must be, therefore, considered larger than would have been secured under ordinary circumstances. In 1872, when Grant ran against Greeley, the Republican majority went up to 137,548. In 1882, when Pattison (Dem.) was elected Governor, there was a Republican split, resulting in two Republican candidates. But Pattison, who had a plurality of 40,202, lacked only 3,541 of a majority over both the Republicans, and, had the Greenback-Labor vote of 23,996 been added to his count (and the majority of that vote was drawn from the Democratic side), he would have had over 20,000 majority. In 1883 the Republican candidate for Attorney-General was elected by only 17,075 majority, and in 1886 the majority against Black (Dem.) was only 42,651, with no Republican scandals to assist him. Looking at figures alone, there is, therefore, no impossibility in defeating Quay this year. In any other State but Pennsylvania it would be safe to count on his defeat by the apathy of disgusted Republicans who would not vote at all, combined with the votes of those who would condemn Quayism in the most emphatic manner by voting squarely for Pattison. In this State the 53,451 majority for Gov. Dix in 1872 was changed to a majority of 50,317 for his opponent two years later, through the influence of the hard times. The intelligence of Pennsylvania ought to be influenced as much by a question of political morals as New York was by a question of profits and wages.

There are two powerful influences working against Quay this year, the result of which cannot yet be foreseen, viz.: the po-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sition against his ticket taken by the labor leaders and the farmers' organization. Men like Powderly have come out openly for Pattison, and it is known that the great body of miners look on the Democratic candidate as a protector of their interests. That Quay knows this and fears its effect, is shown by his haste to devise means to split the labor vote from the Democrats. Moreover, the Philadelphia *Record* says that there is evidence of a serious change of feeling on the part of the farmers of Pennsylvania in regard to the tariff; that the McKinley Bill, following the Cleveland message, has opened their eyes, and that a revolt against McKinleyism is to be expected, aside from any question of Quayism.

If Quay can count as surely on the fidelity of the Republican voters of Pennsylvania as he can on the servility of the Republican press of the State, he need worry very little about the result. With one or two exceptions, even journals which denounced Quay in advance of the Convention, journals which fearlessly point out errors of their party and of its representatives at Washington, conceal the crime of Quay from their readers, and urge the election of his ticket. One of these, the Philadelphia *Ledger*, thus lightly dismissed the possible Republican opposition to Quayism in a political article the other day:

"It is known to every one familiar with political contests that those leaders who are disaffected immediately following a nomination they opposed, almost invariably fall into line and support it throughout the active part of the campaign and at the polls. As for the independent vote, it is said that its opposition to Mr. Delamater is not to be feared, and it is notable that the larger part of those who were prominent leaders of the independent movement of 1882, which swept Mr. Pattison into the Governor's chair, are now among the heartiest sustainers of the Republican candidate. Among men of business in this city and throughout the State, to whom he is known as an enterprising man of business, Mr. Delamater is highly respected, esteemed, and trusted. All indications are that the party will not be greatly divided upon his candidacy."

The Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph*, another Republican journal of the class indicated, says:

"These early efforts to make it appear that there is going to be a landslide of workingmen and agriculturists in favor of Pennsylvania Democracy this year, will fall to the ground and be forgotten before the real battle begins. The people of Pennsylvania know what the real issues of the hour are, and they will not be turned aside by appeals to their passions or prejudices. Here and there will be found a man of more or less prominence, like Mr. Marshall of Pittsburgh, over whose defection there will be much noise made by the enemy; but throughout the length and breadth of the State, a full month after the nominations have been made, there are no signs whatever of any serious break in the Republican lines; no sign that the Democratic party will be able to do more than march up the hill next November and then march down again."

We make these quotations, not to accept the views expressed as a correct statement of the present political situation in Pennsylvania, but to show the apathy of public conscience there which certainly does exist. It is yet too early to form an opinion of the result in November. If the vote were to be cast now, it is more than probable that Delamater would be beaten, notwithstanding the apparent apathy and the dereliction of certain respectable newspapers.

SHORTENING THE COLLEGE COURSE.

In the *Atlantic Monthly* for August Prof. Shaler grapples with a problem as difficult as it is important. Should his solution of it be adopted, he will have surpassed the desert of the traditional man who made two blades of grass grow where but one grew before, for he will have added a year to the productive life of our educated men. While this may not seem high praise to the believer in culture in and for itself, even he would perhaps not regard it as an unworthy result when attained without diminution of the learning that is not directly profitable, and this result Prof. Shaler considers attainable. Those who do not regard the acquisition of knowledge, however delightful it may be, as intrinsically the highest of ends, will certainly rejoice to learn that there is a prospect of extending the period of its application.

For, as Prof. Shaler very frankly admits, the schools of the American people, the recipients of money and devotion in a measure never known before, "have failed to serve the needs of the communities which so carefully cherished them." Their teachers "have made little effort to accommodate the training they give the youth to the requirements of the world." The graduate, while not quite so helpless as the newspapers represent him, is yet ill-prepared for active life, and, after he has fairly engaged in it, retains at best only the general enlargement which his scholastic career has impressed upon him. The perception of this truth has brought our colleges into a certain disfavor. They are, Prof. Shaler declares, less and less resorted to by our youth, who tend to seek entrance to the professions and other educated callings through schools of a lower grade. The testimony of parents who have selected these byways is, in brief, that a college education costs too much, that it takes too long, and that in most occupations it does not aid a student.

It does not follow, if we concede that there is an element of truth in these objections, that the technical or professional school is a proper substitute for the college. It is a duty that each generation owes to its successor to pass on the store of knowledge accumulated by the race, and "the first object of all true culture is to enfranchise the youth by showing him all that we can concerning the lofty thought and action of his predecessors, as well as the nature of the universe, which has been revealed by their labors." Upon the whole, it seems that this work can only be done in the university. An atmosphere exists there that exists nowhere else, and Prof. Shaler's deliberate testimony as to the visible, the "singular," enlargement produced by the communal life of students at Harvard carries with it great weight. "If it were possible to set before the reader a series of pictures which should show the usual stages of intellectual development of youths in their four years' life in this university, and against them to place a similar series depicting the history of their playmates who had been nurtured on the scantier fare of real bread-winning life, we should have no farther need to debate the value of academic training."

This training, therefore, let every one get who can, but let it be remembered that the college is made for man, and not man for the college. If the training is so desirable, it ought to be furnished in such a way that a student might begin his active life before reaching the age of twenty-six or twenty-seven years. Within a generation Harvard College has required at least one year more of work preparatory to admission, under the expectation that the fitting schools would manage to send pupils with this additional preparation at the same age as before. This expectation having been disappointed, it remains to be seen whether time can be spared at the other end of the course; for it cannot be taken from the professional side of the student's work.

This could be done very simply by making the academic period three years instead of four. But it would be better, in Prof. Shaler's opinion, to give degrees to those who have rapidly attained the end of the prescribed culture after three years, while others should continue their studies for a year longer. Or, the student who is sufficiently developed might begin his professional studies in his Sophomore or Junior year, and complete the first year of them before going into the professional school. Prof. Shaler considers either of these methods as practicable, and in the light of his experience desirable. Contrary to his original prejudices, he now believes that it would favorably affect the development of most students to have a distinct professional motive soon after entering college. There would be the incidental advantages of rendering it possible to recognize the claims of general culture in the professional school, and of combining the interests of the several faculties of the university. There are now injurious gaps and clefts between stages of education, whereas the lifework should be merged in the general culture for the advantage of both teachers and pupils.

As to the cost of education, this shortening of the course would reduce it *pro tanto*; but otherwise Prof. Shaler is rather vague in his observations. If the tuition fee at Harvard could be reduced from $150 to $50 per annum, of course more students could pay it, but such a reduction would equal the interest on about $2,500,000. He does not refer to the loss of revenue that would result from a shortening of the course. He thinks it "doubtful if the interests of the higher education would be served by over-much diminution in the sacrifices which parents now have to make to procure it for their children," and maintains that this education should be open only to those who have some natural fitness for it and are willing to strive for it. Still, he concludes that its cost is far too high for the public good.

What is most striking in this article is the glimmering of a truth which professional educators have been singularly slow to apprehend—the inequality of minds and of mental development. Our theory of education resembles the present socialistic theory in providing that all scholars must proceed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pari passu; that none shall get on any faster than the rest; and, as a necessary consequence, that the course of study shall be limited by the abilities of the slower minds. But the enormous differences in capacity which the active life of the world discloses in men exist most palpably among children. On Prof. Shaler's showing, the first fourteen years of life are, so far as the scholastic education of boys is concerned, practically a blank, and where this is not so, parents find themselves with their boys on their hands ready for college a year or two before the customary period. Where the development has been injudiciously managed, some "keeping back" may be necessary, but in many cases it is a sheer waste of the boy's life, so far as his future success is concerned. We have little doubt that most intelligent teachers would undertake to fit bright boys for college at sixteen if not at fourteen, provided they could get hold of them early enough. We fear that the trouble lies back of the training schools, in the family; and that it will continue so long as mothers prefer to intrust the care of their children at the most plastic age to ignorant nurses, rather than devote their own time to so laborious and exacting a task.

In this view it is encouraging to hear Prof. Shaler denouncing "the injurious and dangerous notion that there is a definite term of years required to attain the culture represented by the bachelor's degree." He finds the variation in the development of students at the beginning of their Junior year very great, and this variation, we apprehend, may be detected at an earlier age. He finds, too, "that the ablest students, after a time in college, have satisfied their possibilities of culture for its own sake, and can no longer find comfort in endeavors which are not related to deeds they desire to accomplish in active life." This concession will awaken a melancholy echo in the breasts of many men now past the hope of farther development, a bitter regret for those high days of buoyant, all-conquering enthusiasm when so much might have been done, but when dry husks were all that was granted to those who thirsted for the living water.

Should a change of the character suggested by Prof. Shaler be made, it might lead to the farther inquiry whether the length of college vacations is not excessive. Perhaps eight hours in the day is enough for work, but eight months in the year certainly seems a moderate allowance for study. Men who are seriously at work in the world take such vacations only exceptionally. It would bore them to death if they had to stop work for a third of the year. It may be said that studies may be prosecuted in vacation, but this can seldom be done to advantage in the absence of the accustomed conveniences and stimuli. Most college students, unless they have pecuniary or social opportunities for having a good time, find the long vacation irksome and unnecessary. Certainly, no one who beholds the college student of to-day as he appears at the watering-place will find it easy to believe that his system demands the cessation of intellectual application during the entire summer. Unfortunately, the witnesses best qualified by knowledge to testify on this subject, the professors themselves, are disqualified by interest.

JEFFERSON'S CONSTITUTION FOR VIRGINIA.

WASHINGTON, July 28, 1890.

EARLY in May, 1776, a convention of "delegates from the counties and corporations in the Colony of Virginia" assembled at Williamsburgh—the legislative and administrative body that was to bridge the passage from a government under the King to a government of the people, republican in form and spirit. For more than a year the nominal head of the colony, Lord Dunmore, had been powerless except for mischief, winning for himself, by his injudicious efforts to enforce the rule of his royal master, the enmity, and even hatred, of the "good people" of the colony. For more than a year local committees, self-constituted, acting as revolutionary bodies, and therefore under no laws or general system, had exercised what functions of defence, and too often of offence, were deemed necessary by a majority of their members, governed only by the rules of self-preservation. From these local committees grew the Colonial Convention, convening without definite aim or purpose, and containing within itself a difference of opinion that promised a protracted contest on every question that involved a change in the social order of the colony. The general constitution and characteristics of the leaders of this Convention have been often described, and in a very satisfactory manner, by a Virginian, Hugh Blair Grigsby, whose sympathies and historical instinct were admirably adapted to sketch in broad outlines the personality of the session.

One circumstance, however, escaped his notice, as, indeed, it has that of every historian of Virginia, a circumstance at once interesting and picturesque—the fact that Jefferson prepared a constitution for the State and submitted it to the Convention. Having instructed its delegates to the Continental Congress to vote for independence of the Crown of Great Britain, the question of self-government naturally presented itself, for the Convention had expressly reserved to itself the "power of forming government for and the regulations of the internal concerns of each colony." The resolution for instructing the delegates on independence had resulted in a compromise, not being pointed enough for such as the Lees and Henry, and being too advanced for the Conservatives, who gave it their vote "for the sake of unanimity." The question of framing a new government awakened a difference of opinion on more than one point. Would it not be well, asked Ludwell Lee, to have the Continental Congress prepare a uniform plan for governing America, to be approved by the colonies? Jefferson wrote to Edmund Randolph to oppose the formation of a permanent constitution for Virginia until a convention could be chosen by the people for that special purpose. "He denied the power of the body, elected (as he conceived them) to be the agents for the management of the war, to exceed some temporary regimen." But Randolph and the gentlemen to whom he showed this letter—Pendleton, Nelson, and Mason—could not accept such a position. They, to use Randolph's words, "saw no distinction between the conceded power to declare independence and its necessary consequence, the fencing of society by the institution of government. Nor were they sure that to be backward in this act of sovereignty might not imply distrust whether the rule had been wrested from the King."

This opinion carried the day, and the Colonial Convention at once set to work to "prepare a declaration of rights, and such a plan of government as will be most likely to maintain peace and order in this colony, and secure substantial and equal liberty to the people." From the 15th of May to the 24th of June a large and able committee was engaged in carrying these instructions into effect, and, after some amendments, on the 28th the first constitution or form of government for Virginia was unanimously adopted. It is known that the chief labor of framing the Constitution had fallen to George Mason, certainly one of the most competent members of the body. Col. Landon Carter, to whose opinion the greatest deference was shown, thought that "ambition had visibly seized so much ignorance all over the colony,' and as a result the Convention abounded "with too many of the inexperienced creatures to navigate our bark on this dangerous coast." On the other hand, Patrick Henry, the leader of the popular element in the assemblage, complained of a want of associates of ability on his side of the question.

This complaint conveyed much meaning, for the social condition of the colony had given rise to two quite distinct factions, apart from the political difference that the Revolution had produced. Whigs and Tories were known; but the "good people"—that is, those who were opposed to the government of Parliament and the British Ministry—were divided among themselves quite as sharply as were ever the Whigs from the Tories. The large land-owners formed an aristocracy, of great influence and of conservative views, while opposed to them were the so-called radicals and reformers, who, of more ardent nature, were intent upon introducing as great a revolution in the form of government for the colony as had been implied by the separation from English control. Henry complained that the aristocrats were strong in the committee appointed to frame a constitution, and that "my most esteemed republican form has many and powerful enemies." Each party had its printed argument: the one supported an anonymous tract sent to the Convention from Philadelphia with a strong endorsement from Carter Braxton; the other read with approval the 'Thoughts on Government' written by John Adams.

Adams had addressed his pamphlet to George Wythe. It was Wythe who carried to the convention a sketch or outline of a constitution which Jefferson, then in Congress, prepared. This, wrote Jefferson in 1825,

> "I sent to Mr. Pendleton, President of the Convention, on the mere possibility that it might suggest something worth incorporating into that before the Convention. He informed me afterwards by letter that he received it on the day on which the Committee of the Whole had reported to the House the plan they had agreed to; that that had been so long in hand, so disputed inch by inch, and the subject of so much altercation and debate, that they were worried with the contentions it produced, and could not, from mere lassitude, have been induced to open the instrument again; but that, being pleased with the Preamble to mine, they adopted it in the House by way of amendment to the Report of the Committee; and thus my preamble became tacked to the work of George Mason."

It is not a little curious that Jefferson did not retain among his papers a copy of this attempt of his at constitution-making, or that he should not have had enough pride in his bantling to make some reference to its nature. He was, as a rule, careful in such matters. Of the composition that made his reputation as a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writer before he entered Congress—the 'Summary View'—he wrote out two copies, one of which was sent to Patrick Henry. Of the Declaration of Independence he made a number of manuscript copies and distributed them among his intimates. In 1783 he prepared a draft of a constitution for the State, and so proud of it was he, as "reaching all the great objects of public liberty," that he printed it. His indifference to his earlier sketch is all the more noticeable as it allowed John Adams to pose as the mainstay of the Virginia Convention; for he claimed that it was his little pamphlet that influenced the Convention, and, while "amazed to find an inclination so prevalent throughout all the Southern colonies to adopt plans so nearly resembling that in the 'Thoughts on Government,'" he was not a little elated that the "pride of the haughty must, I see, come down a little in the South." He had felt not a little the arrogance of the Southern members in the first and second Congresses, but he knew well how essential it was to keep with them. The fact remains that for more than a century Jefferson's draft has been lost, and it has only recently been discovered near Lexington—two copies of it, both in Jefferson's MS., one with and the other wanting the preamble. Is it too great a stretch to conjecture that one, at least, was the identical manuscript that Wythe carried to Pendleton?

It would naturally be expected that Jefferson would favor a democratic constitution—one, that is, which embodied the idea that all powers rested with the people; yet his plan was less democratic than the instrument adopted by the Convention, for he would allow the people to participate directly only in the election of the lower house of the Assembly. All else was based upon a narrow foundation. The Senate was to be "appointed" by the House, and his first idea contemplated an appointment for life; but a second thought led him to make a term of service three years. The judges of the General Court and of the High Court of Chancery were to sit in the Senate, and be allowed to speak to a question, but they could not vote. The Executive, called "Administrator," a Deputy, a Privy Council, and a Treasurer were all to hold their offices of the House of Representatives; but all other officers, civil and military, with two exceptions, were to be appointed by the Administrator, such appointment being subject to the negative of the Privy Council. The people (that is, the freeholders) were to elect annually the high sheriffs and coroners of counties.

The lower house of the Legislature in this way received all the privileges of appointment the King and Parliament possessed in the colonial system. All offices were then held at the gift of the King, and the Council was of royal appointment. The House of Burgesses alone was chosen by popular election, and its powers, save for annoyance and obstruction, were limited by the King's instructions to the Governor—instructions that could not be enforced by the Governor without the tedious, uncertain, and often dangerous appeal to the King to interpose his veto to a measure contrary to his wishes. The fear of a strong executive of the royal order led Jefferson to deny to the Governor any veto on the acts of the Legislature, and it was due to Patrick Henry that the power to negative was granted by the Convention, as he very properly proved that the want of it would tend to make the Governor an independent and not a coördinate branch of power. Jefferson himself may have seen the danger of this centralization of power in the hands of a single house, the members of which were to be chosen annually, but, once chosen, possessed the power to sit "so long as they should think the publick service requires"; for he appears to have had some doubt on the manner of appointing the Administrator and his deputy, naming the House of Representatives tentatively, for the words are enclosed in brackets. Even he provided that the "legislative, executive, and judicial offices shall be kept for ever separate." The actual constitution as adopted provided for a Senate composed of members elected once in four years from Senatorial districts; a House, chosen annually from each county; and with the two combined lay the appointment of Governor and Council, the judges of the Superior Courts, Auditors, Attorney-General, Treasurer, Register of the Land Office, and Delegates to Congress. That was more democratic than Jefferson's idea.

The manner of electing Jefferson's House—the body of kingly powers—is worthy of notice. In the session of 1769 the qualifications of a voter were a freehold estate, or fifty acres of unsettled land, or twenty-five acres where there was a house, or a city lot improved—provisions liberal enough to include nearly the entire manhood of the colony, where land was to be had almost for the asking. Jefferson wished to require "full age and sane mind," a freehold estate in land, that for the country being decreased to twenty-five acres; and he also gave the suffrage to "all persons resident in the colony who shall have paid scot and lot to Government the last two years." Not content with this, he would make every man in the colony a qualified voter. "Every person of full age, neither owning nor having owned [50] acres of land shall be entitled to an appropriation of [50] or to so much as shall make up what he owns or has owned to [50] acres, in full and absolute dominion, and no other person shall be capable of taking an appropriation."

Having thus turned every man of full age and sane mind in the colony into a landholder and a voter, Jefferson passed to the question of representation, and here offered a distinct improvement upon the plan of the Convention. Among the complaints brought against the English Constitution (and its faults attracted at that time more attention than its virtues) was the inequality of representation in the British House of Commons. Yet the Convention provided for a representation of the counties in the lower house of Assembly quite as unequal as the British examples, for each county was to send two members without respect to the population it contained. Randolph explained the acceptance of this provision by saying "that the counties to the eastward of the Blue Ridge, in which the inequality was most glaring, were too numerous to be irritated, and it was tacitly understood that every body and individual came into the revolution with their rights, and was to continue to enjoy them as they existed under the former government." Jefferson, on the other hand, would give a representative for every 400 freeholders, thus basing it upon population. The result of the retention of the old provision was that "nineteen thousand, living in one part of the country, give law to upwards of thirty thousand living in another, and appoint all their chief officers, executive and judiciary."

Two-thirds of either house constituted a quorum, and there was little limit to the powers or functions of the Assembly. Capital punishment was abolished save in cases of murder and of offences against military discipline; and a law for levying money could not remain in force longer than ten years from the time of its commencement. Beyond this the Assembly could legislate on any subject, for it was the executive that was the object of Jefferson's jealousy, and round which he sought to throw prohibitions and restrictions. The Administrator "shall possess the powers formerly held by the King," save only that he could not dissolve, prorogue, or adjourn either house; he could not declare war or make peace, issue letters of marque or reprisal, raise or introduce armed forces, build armed vessels, forts, or strongholds; he could not coin money or regulate its value, or regulate weights and measures, or erect courts, offices, boroughs, corporations, fairs, markets, ports, beacons, light-houses, or sea marks; nor could he lay an embargo, nor prohibit the exportation of any commodity for a longer space than forty days; nor could he make denizens, pardon crimes, or remit fines or punishments, or create dignities or grant rights of precedence. All these powers or functions could be exercised by the Legislature alone. The Administrator was liable to action, though not to personal restraint, for private duties or wrongs, and all his acts were to be controlled by law. The want of a veto on the acts of the Assembly made him powerless to oppose what he might deem a dangerous policy, and would have rendered supreme what does in fact tend to become the most powerful element in a republican government, the Legislature.

There is much in this draft that does not properly belong to a constitution, much that was later the subject of special legislation in Virginia under Jefferson's own direction. He would have abolished slavery to this extent: "No person hereafter coming into this country shall be held in slavery under any pretext whatever." He would have abolished entails, and made all descents go "according to the laws of Gavelkind, save only that females shall have equal rights with males." Seven years' residence, or a declaration of an intention to such a residence, and a subscription to the fundamental laws of the commonwealth, would entitle a person to "all the rights of persons natural born." Religious liberty was provided for; printing-presses should be free, "except so far as by commission of private injury they may give cause for private action." There should be no standing army except in time of war, but the freeman was not to be debarred the use of arms "within his own lands or tenements." Royal claims to wrecks, waifs, strays, treasure trove, mines, royal fish and royal birds were declared to be "usurpations on common right" and abolished. The judiciary system of the State was elaborately provided for, but the details of that branch need not be described. Finally, "no salaries shall be given to the Administrator, members of the legislative houses, judicial officers, privy councillors, or delegates to the American Congress"; but, should the Legislature so direct, the "reasonable expences" of these officers "for subsistence while acting in the duties of their office" might be borne by the public.

Such were the main features of the instrument which Jefferson devised for the government of Virginia. The details are of interest not only in themselves, but to an even greater degree for the light they throw upon a contemporary document, the authorship of which is still one of the unsolved problems. I have already mentioned a tract which appeared during the sessions of the Convention, and which had been sent from Philadelphia about the same time as Adams's 'Thoughts on Government.' Little was known of its origin, but as it bore a strong recommendation from Carter Braxton, he was suspected of being its author, and came in for the blame that his ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressions of doubtful Whiggism aroused. Yet this pamphlet embodied in its proposed constitution many of the features that Jefferson inserted in his draft. A lower house elected for three years, a Senate chosen for life by the House, a Governor, Treasurer, Secretary, and "other great officers of the State" elected by the lower house, judges to be appointed by the Governor, with the advice of his privy council, and all military and inferior civil officers to hold their appointments of the Governor—this was as narrow a system as that of Jefferson's, and as open to the objection of centralization. The one, however, was regarded by the Convention as an "aristocratic" programme, and Braxton received some pretty hard knocks for recommending it; yet Jefferson's was quite as aristocratic.

By comparing his Constitution of 1783 with that of 1776, it may easily be seen how great a stride Jefferson had taken in democracy. As the proposition of 1783 is included in his published works, it may be referred to and need not detain me here. A later proposition, a suggestion for a change in the State Constitution, appears never to have been noticed. It is without date, and Jefferson's hand-writing changed so little in the active years of his life as to furnish no clue to the period at which a memorandum may have been made. The paper on which this note was written is watermarked 1794, so it may be attributed to that period of leisure which followed his retirement from Washington's Cabinet, while he was nursing his sore grief over the monarchical tendencies of the Administration, and the growth of centralization that threatened to swallow up the individual States and erect an engine of oppression such as the world had never seen. With such an incubus resting upon him, it is not to be wondered at that he should have developed an almost extreme democratic remedy. I doubt if the like proposition has ever been seriously broached in a community that claims to be self-governed, or that is capable of exercising due judgment in matters of government. After providing for the election of a legislature, to consist of not less than 150 or more than 300 members, Jefferson makes this original proposition:

"The Legislature shall form one house only for the verification of their credentials, or for what relates to their privileges. For all other business they shall be separated by lot into two chambers, which shall be called [α and ω], on the first day of their session in every week; which separation shall be effected by presenting to the representatives from each county separately a number of lots equal to their own number, if it be an even one, or to the next even number above, if their number be odd, one-half of which lots shall be distinctly marked for the one chamber, and the other half for the other; and each member shall be, for that week, of the chamber whose lot he draws. . . .

"Each chamber shall appoint a Speaker for the session, and it shall be weekly decided by lot between the two Speakers of which chamber each shall be for the ensuing week."

It is unfortunate for us that merely the bald proposition is made, without the interesting explanation of the reasons for the proposed change that Jefferson might have recorded. In the absence of such an explanation, it is difficult to conjecture his purpose, for this weekly shifting of members and speakers of two houses, elected by the same constituencies, would have introduced as great a novelty into the political system of Virginia as did Jefferson's famous *pêle-mêle* into the social system of Washington. The latter almost produced a diplomatic complication that war alone could solve; the former would have produced legislative anarchy that nothing but a reversion to the earlier Constitution could have cured. That he had some purpose must be conceded, for during his Presidency he generally sought to cover his policy by special amendments to the Constitution, as in the case of the Louisiana purchase, internal improvements by the national Government, and a national university. Yet there is nothing in the political condition of Virginia between 1794 and 1801 that could call for such a remarkable experiment in government, nor does the proposition appear to have been submitted to his friends. None the less, it was a genuine product of Jefferson's mind, and as such is essential to understand the progression of his political ideas.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

FURTHER IMPRESSIONS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LONDON, July 23, 1890.

THE session of Parliament draws near its close. It has been in the main, and considering possibilities, a wasted session. That contempt or regardlessness of public opinion which disgraces the policy of the Government towards Ireland has infected their handling of British questions, and brought humiliation and lessened majorities. The really fine and well-intentioned men who back the Government, entangled in mazes of their leaders' devising, are often to be pitied. What may befall the other side of the House when (in the ascendant) their errors and shortcomings are exposed and followed up with the merciless and unpitying hostility that has been meted out to the present Government?

I do not propose, however, now considering general politics, but rather desire to take up the thread of previous remarks upon the life and constitution of the House of Commons. Subsequent experiences have only deepened my interest in the study. It is a democratic assembly in the best sense, often reminding me of the Society of Friends. In the long run a man takes his place according to his abilities and honesty of purpose, irrespective of his station or means. The size of London and the consequent freedom of London life doubtless contribute to this result. There is not much opportunity of comparing men except as they appear in the House. Moreover, the House is a sort of school of manners. Rude language or ungentlemanly demeanor is rare, the arrangements and the general bearing of its members are in accordance with the usages of good society, and yet the manners and customs in some respects, before they are understood, may appear brusque and cold. Your nearest friend there will brush past you in silence, the leader of your party will meet you without a look. You may sit down to write at a table next a man whom you have entertained at your home and not receive the slightest recognition. The speedy retirement of an old politician after a short trial of Parliamentary life, which once puzzled me, has lately been explained as having arisen from his inability to comprehend this usage and his resentment of it. It may be termed essentially English. It shocks at first. But you soon perceive that it really contributes towards members leading their own lives, as well as their political lives, in the House, and you find that, at meals, in the tea-room, the smoking-room, or on the terrace, and always if there is real occasion for intercourse, the old human nature is there.

Many a man who has been perhaps a life-long advocate of a cause may have to guard himself against pique when he becomes aware that he is now nowhere in comparison with others who have recently brought higher abilities than his to the conflict. And, perhaps more difficult still, he may have to be satisfied with but scant intercourse with some who sought information from him when they were first awakening to a great subject, and who, having accepted the light, now, in the course of the struggle, naturally and properly associate with those of their own intellectual calibre. The instances are few, and I believe will long continue so, in which any but men of university training can attain great permanent eminence in the government of the British Empire.

Whatever a man may have been in his own district or circle, on first entering the House he probably feels himself rather like a puppy thrown into water. He has to find his own level anew, to sink or swim almost without pity and without help. One wisely conscious of really great abilities will recognize an unequalled opportunity for their use. The vain or self-sufficient, who have perhaps bartered means or principles for seats, will before long recognize that as vestrymen or guardians of the poor at home they were of more account; it must often be a rude awakening. To attain first place, power of common-sense debate, not necessarily of oratory, is essential. Nevertheless, the mediocre man who has offered his services or accepted service on principle, who has no desire to appear anything he is not, and who is more anxious for the triumph of right than for personal success, will perhaps, after experiencing a certain sense of humiliation, and after sounding the depths, eventually feel the ground under him and come to be satisfied with his own position as part of the great whole. Most men of feeling will have to acknowledge that in the first few months of their novitiate, seasons of discouragement alternate with periods of elation.

I have closely watched the Speaker and Mr. Courtney, the Chairman of Committees, and both win my admiration. Their position often requires the patience of Job, and that they generally show. The occasions upon which I have been struck with their forbearance have outnumbered those upon which they appear hasty or unfair; the guillotine of "order" comes down as mercilessly on the Cabinet Minister as on the unwary and inexperienced neophyte. If the one is excused, owing to the importance of the subject that has diverted him from the strict lines of debate, with the other the rules are stretched because of his inexperience. Opponents on both sides are keener than the occupant of the chair in checking a speaker. Apart from the action of the Government in their policy towards Ireland, I perceive no difference between the treatment of Irish members and that of members of the great British parties. The Irish whips, one of whom has, as Mr. Balfour's criminal, spent a considerable time in prison, are accorded their own convenient, handsomely furnished room. Whenever the Irish party meets in secret conclave, a large, well-appointed apartment is at its service. A presentation to Mr. and Mrs. O'Brien took place the other day in one of the grand committee-rooms. If Mr. Parnell desired to give a dinner in the House, the suite of refreshment-rooms would, on an "off evening," doubtless be placed at his disposal, as they were upon a late occasion relegated to Mr. Matthews, the Home Secretary. It is, indeed, a remarkable illustration of the force of justice and persistence, and of the sense of fair play and respect for vigorous opponents innate in the English character, that the Irish party should attain their present position in the House. That position belies the assumption that they are a pack of unreliable scoundrels,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bent upon the destruction of the British Empire.

It may not be generally known that a member of Parliament does not as such receive one penny of remuneration or reimbursement for travelling, living, or otherwise. He is allowed a limited number of copies of each bill, and one each of other documents. Beyond this he must pay like any one else. I have been curious to inquire regarding privileges accorded to members out of the House; so far, all I have been able to discover are the right, which I have not availed myself of, to sit in a particular pew at St. Margaret's, Westminster, and that of procuring a reading order at the British Museum without the signature of a London householder—an immunity not extended to the member's wife. True, there is the chance of splendid prizes to the members of the British parties. They must, however, increasingly be reserved for the especially capable. It is a remarkable manifestation of the love of work and desire to serve others, more or less mixed with perhaps the love of influence and importance, extant in humanity, that so many should toil in committee and otherwise, day after day, session after session, without fee or reward, in a manner that can never be fully appreciated by the outside public.

The arrangements to prevent "lobbying" are perfect. The House can be entered by members in half-a-dozen ways. The public, except reporters and private secretaries who have permanent orders, are admitted by only one entrance to the outer lobby on satisfying the police that they have some business. Members have no occasion to be in this lobby. Cards are carried in by attendants, and there are always sufficient good reasons for a member not to respond unless so inclined.

The enormous salaries, the overgrown pensions, the extent to which the aristocracy manages to provide for itself out of the public purse, the immense expense of establishments, are striking characteristics of the British system. Take the Speaker, who never serves very many years, whose duties occupy him only seven months of the twelve and five days of the week. He has £5,000 a year for life, a palatial residence, patronage and privileges of all kinds, and is generally accorded a peerage, while a life pension of £4,000 a year is continued to his son and grandson. This whole system is, however, honest and above-board. There it is in black and white. The English people can alter it whenever they wish. Not only are all the accounts and payments raked over in Committee of the House, but there is a highly paid Auditor-General, who at present happens to be an Irishman. He presents a voluminous annual report upon the payments of each previous year, and there is an Accounts Committee, before which he and the accountants of the different departments appear. His criticisms are fully inquired into, the accountants examined, the evidence printed, and a report drawn up which influences the estimates for the succeeding year. Under these arrangements, honestly carried out, as I believe them to be, it would be difficult for serious malversation to occur. The case that excited most comment and occupied most time in the Accounts Committee this year was one in which some material paid for but not immediately required by Government had been handed over to a private customer, who wanted it at once, by the contractor, before he had replaced it for the Government service.

My Parliamentary experience deepens day by day my conviction of the impossibility of a long continuance of the effort to govern Ireland by coercion, against the wishes of its people and their representatives. Residence in this great free country, especially in this great free metropolis, only accentuates the difference that separates British and Irish methods of government. My respect for the character and personnel of the Irish Parliamentary party has been increased by closer contact. It is in some of its parts a rough instrument, but it was the only instrument available under the circumstances, and never was it more powerful and effectual than it now is. There is no sense of servitude in being a constituent member. The party is consolidated by common conviction and the necessities of the situation. The leaders are less exacting than are the members towards each other. The higher tendencies of the movement assert themselves. There remain many difficulties to overcome and dangers to avoid. There will at first be bitter disappointment in Ireland among certain classes at the results of success. More and more, however, is it becoming evident that we are on the threshold of the accomplishment of one of the most desirable and unexpected consummations in British history—the heart union of Great Britain and Ireland; and an individual who in his lifetime had seen that and the abolition of American slavery would have more than his own share of good. D. B.

Correspondence.

"*HAPPIFY*."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As I remember it, American pulpit-oratory of half a century ago was occasionally marked by peculiarities indicating no very refined taste. Frequent, among such of these as did not originate on our soil, were the ancient *agone*, the lumbering *renewedly*, and the unlovely *happify*. The first, it hardly need be said, was long current in literature. On the contrary, the second, though it occurs in Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa Harlowe*, was never an item of the accepted vocabulary of England. Nor, most probably, has *happify* often found its way into books. Yet it has not been wholly confined to the spoken language. On its recent appearance in an English periodical, inquiry was made for quotations determining its use. Two I am able to give. Joshua Sylvester writes: "One short Mis-hap for-euer *Happifies*." Thus ends his "Tropheis of the life and tragedie of the death of Henry the Great," appended to Edward Grimston's "Heroyk Life and deplorable Death of the most Christian King Henry the fourth" (1612), translated from the French of Pierre Matthieu. The verse, as here cited, is at p. 1090 of Sylvester's *Works*, ed. 1621. My other quotation is from Samuel Holland: "A Merchant . . . will think himself *happyfy'd* in having the honour to transport your self and Soto, your Squire." *Zara* (1656), p. 88 (ed. 1719).

Happify, exhibiting the Latinistic *-fy* suffixed to an English adjectival base, has never been recognized as reputable; and formations classifiable with it, as *fiftify* (*i. e.* 50fy, with playful reference to *fortyfy*=40fy), *filthify*, *fustify*, *gladify*, *muddify*, *prettify*, *sleepify*, *tipsify*, *turpify*, *uglify*, etc., are, all, unless one is to except *cockneyfy*, debarred from formal discourse.

As to verbs like *speechify*, few of them have gained admission into serious writing. Yet Bp. Aylmer (1559) has *doltify*; *foolify* enjoys the sanction of the Rev. Dr. Meredith Hanmer (1581), Dr. Philemon Holland (1609), and Bp. Richard Mountagu (1621); and numerous authors have patronized *ladify*.

Among old and new verbs in *-fy*, miscellaneous, lingually and in other respects, as regards their first element, some of the rarer for which I have collected quotations are *assify*, *bodify*, *boundify*, *caprify*, *citify*, *clerify*, *constellify*, *daintify*, *dandify*, *deathify*, *dedify*, *donkeyfy*, *duncify*, *erectify*, *fancify*, *finify*, *fishify*, *fussify*, *gummify*, *hindrify*, *hominify*, *idolify*, *jellify*, *laurify*, *mountaineerify*, *mynheerify*, *nettlefy*, *nigrify*, *nugify*, *ornify*, *oxify*, *paucify*, *prosify*, *pulchrify*, *punchify*, *puppify*, *quizzify*, *tawdrify*, *tourify*, *twistify*, *unclify*, *unegofy*, *ungentlefy*, *unipsefy*, *Vauxhallify*, and *vestrify*, with a considerable group of oddities from Sir Thomas Urquhart's translation of Rabelais.

Otherwise than in humorous or familiar composition, we meet with few of the coinages just instanced. The oldest of them seems to be the ridiculous *dedify*, "dedicate," which was in print before 1500. In *ornify*, used by the Rev. Dr. John Donne and Richard Brathwait, since its leading member is *ournen*, *ourne*, *aourn*, *anorn*, "adorn," we have a compound not very much better than Samuel Holland's *hindrify* (1656), and the more modern *argufy*. *Fancify* and *finify*, instead of being recent inventions, were, both of them, ventured by Henry, Earl of Monmouth—the first in 1656, and the other in 1650.

Your obedient servant,

F. H.

Marlesford, England, July 4, 1890.

Notes.

It is proposed to publish a memorial volume containing selections from the works of the late William Francis Allen, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. Besides an introductory memoir and a complete bibliography of all his writings, including review articles, it will contain papers representative of his work in English social and economic history, mediæval history, Roman history, Western history, United States history and politics, and the classics, as well as essays upon educational and religious topics. A few of these articles will be monographs selected from the proceedings of various learned societies with which he was associated, showing his scholarly treatment of special topics; but for the most part they will consist of reprints of magazine articles and pamphlets which exhibit his skill in uniting scientific with popular treatment, and which in their present form are in danger of being lost in the mass of periodical literature. A carefully prepared index will be added. The edition will be for advance subscribers only, and will be printed from the type, each copy being numbered. Subscriptions, at $2 a copy, payable upon receipt of the volume, should be sent without delay to Prof. David B. Frankenburger, University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Joseph M. Toner has in press the well-known journals kept by Washington when on a surveying expedition for Lord Fairfax (1748), when conveying a letter from Gov. Dinwiddie to the commandant of the French forces at Fort Le Boeuf, near Lake Erie (1753), and while on a visit to Barbados (1751). They have been very carefully edited, annotated, and indexed.

John Wiley's Sons announce 'Practical Seamanship,' for use in the merchant service, by John Todd and W. B. Whall; and Ruskin's 'Seven Lamps of Architecture' and 'Præterita.'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dodd, Mead & Co.'s autumn list of publications includes a new edition of Fergusson's 'History of Modern Architecture,' revised and brought down to date by Prof. Robert Kerr, with a supplementary volume on Modern Architecture in America, by Montgomery Schuyler; a limited *édition de luxe* of a new 'Memoir of Horace Walpole,' by Austin Dobson; a similar edition of the same author's poem, "A Sun-Dial"; 'The Devil's Picture Books: A History of Playing Cards,' by M. K. Van Rensselaer; six volumes in the new series, "Makers of America," beginning with 'Alexander Hamilton,' by Prof. W. G. Sumner; 'Mungo Park and the Niger,' by Joseph Thomson, in the series called "Great Explorers and Explorations"; a "Giunta Series" "intended to include the classics of literature in every department"; 'Our Mother Tongue,' by Theodore H. Mead; 'Ardis Claverden,' a novel, by Frank R. Stockton; 'Wanneta the Sioux,' by Warren K. Moorhead; 'The Delight Makers, a Novel of Pueblo Indian Life,' by Adolf F. Bandelier; 'The Silver Caves,' by Ernest Ingersoll; 'My Study Fire,' essays by Hamilton Wright Mabie; 'Désirée, Queen of Sweden and Norway,' from the French of Baron Hochschild by Mrs. M. Carey; and 'The Jew,' a novel from the Polish of J. I. Kraszewski.

J. B. Lippincott Co. publish directly 'In and Out of Book and Journal,' selections by Dr. A. Sydney Roberts, with illustrations by Van Schaick; 'Gleanings for the Curious from the Harvest-fields of Literature,' by Dr. C. C. Bombaugh; 'European Days and Ways,' by Alfred E. Lee; 'Two Modern Women,' by Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells; 'An Elementary History of the United States,' by Charles Morris; and 'Sewage Disposal Works,' by W. S. Crimp.

The J. G. Cupples Co., Boston, will publish a fully illustrated life of Paul Revere by Elbridge H. Goss.

Ginn & Co. announce 'A Synopsis of English and American Literature,' by G. J. Smith of the Washington (D. C.) High School.

The ninth volume of Prof. Masson's 'Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey' (Macmillan) appropriately bears on its title-page a vignette portrait of Ricardo, whose writings stimulated De Quincey to produce the papers which form the bulk of this collection entitled "Political Economy and Politics." The latter rubric covers De Quincey's denunciation of the clerical blight on true historic study of the Puritan Revolution. The essay on "California and the Gold-Digging Mania" is an alarm to those not busy in saving mankind from the influx of the yellow metal, which might be expected to lower the ratio to silver to eight to one. "So wide a desolation could not by any device of man reach so vast a body of helpless interests." De Quincey recommended as the first bulwark the repeal of the statute making gold a legal tender for sums above forty shillings. Our silver saviours of society will find much profit in his vaticinations, which are less than forty years old.

Those travellers who are fortunate enough to visit Greece next winter will be glad to have with them, as a supplement to Baedeker, Ch. Diehl's 'Excursions Archéologiques en Grèce' (Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.); and those to whom this good fortune is denied will enjoy making these excursions in their libraries, under M. Diehl's guidance. He takes us to Mycenæ, Delos, Athens, Olympia, Eleusis, Epidauros, Dodona, Tiryns, Tanagra, and Mt. Ptoïon, and describes the results of the recent investigations at each of these sites in a language easily understanded of the people. His aim is to do for Greece what Gaston Boissier has done for Rome and Pompeii, in presenting the scholars' work to the unscholarly in such matters; and, except for an occasional tendency to become too discursive, which is especially noticeable in the chapter on Delos, he has succeeded admirably. He confines himself to the excavations of the last fifteen years, and his book is the first attempt to summarize, in a popular form, the acquisitions made to our knowledge of life in ancient Greece by the work done at all the sites named, in this remarkably active period.

It is not too late for tourists to slip into their satchels the Rev. Julius H. Ward's 'The White Mountains: A Guide to their Interpretation' (Appletons). It is fairly to be called a pocket volume, but is liberally printed and is embellished with well-chosen views, and has a map of the region, which is intended rather to give a general idea than to serve the explorer. Mr. Ward has called to his aid a well-versed member of the Appalachian Club, who lays out a number of routes for pedestrians; and he appends a list of White Mountain papers in *Appalachia*, and of books, from Crawford to Starr King. Mr. Ward's aim is not that of the veteran climber who knows every foot of the mountains, like Mr. W. M. Conway in his guide to the Pennine Alps. He writes from sufficiently extensive acquaintance with the principal peaks, but his "personally conducted" readers are to share particularly his reverent and mystical feelings at the proper time and place. His own preference is to be alone on his excursions, which he takes very solemnly. A gossiping woman on a bridle-path is to him an even more distressing creature than one who does not know "how to take care of herself." Such as approach the mountains in his spirit will no doubt like to compare their sensations with Mr. Ward's. Others may pass lightly over his interpretations to possess themselves of his practical indications.

Those whose summer recreation takes them to New Jersey will find gentler and safer mountain-climbing than in New Hampshire, and will probably overlook the geologic interest of a State whose surface has been thoroughly mapped. Prof. W. M. Davis of Harvard College has lately issued two pamphlets in pursuance of studies which he has made distinctively his own, namely, among the small-sized rivers of the Atlantic slope, whose genesis he seeks to explain. One is a paper from the Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History, on "The Geographic Development of Northern New Jersey"; the other is a lecture before the National Geographic Society on "The Rivers of Northern New Jersey," with notes on the classification of rivers in general. Both are lucid in description, and accompanied by excellent diagrams, and are well calculated to promote that home study which can be made the basis of the soundest scientific observation.

Dr. R. Mahrenholtz, a well-known student of seventeenth and eighteenth-century French, writing in No. 29 of the *Magazin für die Litteratur*, has some interesting remarks on the prevailing confusion in the language of to-day, owing to the invasions of argot, the inventions of the Naturalists, the influence of the southern provinces, etc. His text is Prof. Césaire Villatte's 'Parisismen,' a slang dictionary which has just reached a third edition in Berlin. He instances numerous mutilated forms, of which "photo" for photograph in English is an example; the poetic figurative designations, as *balayeuse*, for a lady whose skirts sweep the streets; the building upon imported words in accordance with French analogy, as lunch, *luncher* (to lunch), *luncheur;* the tendency of the accent to abandon the last syllable (in words of three syllables to seek the middle), and, again, on the one hand, to sound final mute *e* as in poetry (*favorable* in four syllables), on the other in good circles to drop the final syllable in *quatre*, *votre*, etc.; the upsetting of the old rules about the subjunctive, etc. On the whole, though Dr. Mahrenholtz looks with some distrust upon the revolution, he is inclined to see in it a salutary effort to shake off the yoke of the Academy and give the language its free development.

— The August *Harper's* contains several articles of widely differing interest, from Dr. Parkman's experimental retreat to a Roman convent in the days of his youth to an account of the geology of Chicago and an admirable narrative of Custer's last fight, the details of which are pieced together as they have been recovered from many sources, so that we seem to have the story of an eye-witness of a conflict from which no white man escaped alive. Berlin, Magellan, and the streets of India are also promising and noteworthy subjects. We leave these one side, however, to attend to the attack which Mr. Howells makes in "The Study" upon anonymous criticism. For five years now he has had his say upon literature past, present, and to come, and others have criticised what he has pronounced upon Cervantes and Cawein, Thackeray and Ironquill, Scott and Mr. T. S. Perry; and he, displeased, as he acknowledges, at the treatment accorded him, now has his say also upon the pack that worries him. He uses none of those purring adjectives with which he makes a pleasant sound when some votary of "lyrism" draws nigh him from the wild Southwest or the Arcady that neighbors on Toronto. He conceives the profession of criticism as follows: "It is hard enough to treat a fellow-author with respect even when one has to address him, name to name, upon the same level in the open; swooping down upon him in the dark, panoplied in the authority of a great journal, it is impossible. One must then treat him as prey, and strike him into the mire, preparatory to tearing him limb from limb." He speaks of "the constant spectacle" of the "ferocity, incompetence, and dishonesty" of our literary criticism; compares it to the "torture of witnesses"; and, coming to the person of the anonymous critic, says that "he wears a mask chiefly that he may more securely give pain and more of it," calls him "the arrogant, bullying, blundering pedant," refers to his "almost inevitable savagery and dishonesty," and "the sins of pride, of prejudice, and of cruelty which he may safely indulge in the dark," and likens the review which employs him to "the gentleman" who "keeps a masked bravo in his pay." Now, that Mr. Howells most potently believes all this we have no question; but some of these expressions suggest to our minds a doubt whether something more than the habit of signing the name is not needful to the making of that "able, modest, and courteous critic" whose coming Mr. Howells so much desires. So much vituperation is not often to be found in the anonymous criticism of a "great journal," at least in our experience. And, if we may make the old appeal to Philip sober, a glance at the *Atlantic Index* shows no inconsiderable amount of anonymous criticism from his own pen; did he then find it impossible to do aught, "panoplied in the authority" of a greater than a "great journal," except to "swoop down," to "strike into the mire," to "tear limb from limb"? Was it his editorial responsibility that restrained him? Or does he think others incapable of behavior like his own before he emerged from among

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the irresistible temptations of "in the dark"?

—The fact is that Mr. Howells, in nearly all his criticisms during the past five years, has illustrated, by his lack of it, one great advantage of anonymous criticism, when weighted with the authority of a "great journal" or review. He has expressed his personal opinions without let or hindrance; and the result has been a mass of judgments upon great and petty authors which is remarkable for eccentricity, dogmatism, and the spirit of faction. Writing anonymously in a "great journal" checks such idiosyncrasies by virtue of what is known as the traditions of the paper or the review, and this set of traditions is a large element in its authority. A paper, having won its reputation by employing trustworthy writers, carries a presumption that its articles are trustworthy, and is fairly entitled to the favorable disposition of its readers; its tradition is a valuable safeguard for its contributors, and must ordinarily be observed by its staff. Just as the editor is incessantly hedged about, guided, and guarded, in forming his personal judgment, by a sense of public opinion inevitably modifying and entering into his decision, and thus really represents more than by himself alone he would ever have attained to, so, though in a very modest way, the critic of a "great journal" is restricted and limited more or less consciously by the sense of the standards of his paper. It is one of the great benefits of culture, the sure mark of a really educated mind, that the scholar feels more and more the long tradition of literature, the authority of the past resulting from the thought of innumerable minds; he learns to distrust a first and personal impression, and to realize that his danger of error increases in proportion as he departs from the judgments of many others embedded in that tradition and relies upon himself. Mr. Howells's shortcoming as a critic is largely due to his lack of this sense. We have space only to suggest this advantage of responsible anonymous criticism, due to its limitation of the personal element. It falls in with this that criticism is a conservative force, which is one reason why Mr. Howells abominates it; and yet opinion in literature is not a whit more conservative than in religion, politics, or science, and the Keats or Wordsworth of the time has no more difficulty than the Darwin, the Phillips, or the Emerson. It is no hardship that the reformer should justify himself before he is accepted. But apart from such regards as these, the practical and immediate benefits of anonymity are too plain to be mistaken. The signed article can speak frankly only of the dead. We observe that Mr. Howells seldom assails the living, unless it be so impersonal and, in his judgment, mortuary a thing as the *Saturday Review*. The signed article, also, is under the strongest temptation to favor without sincerity, and sometimes to curry favor, for the sake of friendship, real or prospective, with authors and publishers. The signed article handicaps the obscure writer, and too often releases the famous writer from really doing the work, for it is his name, not his examination of the book, that is wanted. And so we could make a catalogue, quite as dreary if not so ferocious as Mr. Howells's, of the disadvantage of signed criticism as a rule. As to the "masked bravo," etc., there is much exaggeration in it. The critic, in our experience, rarely has any intention to inflict "pain and more of it" in our reputable journals; and what truth there is in these fierce charges of the "Study" is no more than that, in all walks of life, there are mean men, and occasionally a fool, and there are blows to give and take from erring and quite honest men. Mr. Howells will find many an example in literary history of how to bear with the insects of the hour, and even the giants of the reviews, without resorting to harsh language.

—The remaining magazines may be briefly dismissed. The *Century* is most notable for an account of the New England community of the town of Mount Desert, by President Eliot, in which he explains in detail the social life and institutions of the typical unit of our people, and reminds socialists, nationalists, anarchists, etc., that with these institutions and this life some forty millions at least of the nation are well content. This is no reason, of course, why the one lost sheep should be suffered to wander, but it suggests that there is no need for entirely reconstructing the fold and inflicting a new brand on the whole flock. The usual serials of travel, fiction, the war, together with an interesting paper on whaling and another on the Yosemite, of great descriptive power, occupy the number. The *Atlantic*, sharing the sudden interest in the women of the French Salon which seems to have attacked all the great monthlies at once like an epidemic, has a paper upon "Madame Cornuel and Madame de Coulanges," of a readable quality; one upon the changes in the college course at Harvard, with general remarks on education, by Prof. Shaler; a discussion of copyright by Mr. Lodge, and poems by Whittier and Holmes. *Scribner's* is confined to a rather poor run of fiction and a gossipy article about Stanley's composition of his book, and with these a description of Paris streets and costumes in the time of the "Three Musketeers" which is capitally done and illustrated. Mr. Aldrich's poem, "The Sister's Tragedy," is the most important contribution from a literary standpoint.

—Prof. Heilprin has transmitted to the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia the results of his barometric measurements of the four highest peaks of the Mexican Republic—namely, Orizaba, Popocatepetl, Ixtaccihuatl, and the Nevado de Toluca. These summits have at various times been measured since the days of Alexander von Humboldt (1804), but the results obtained have in some instances been so broadly divergent as to leave considerable doubt as to the positions which the mountains occupied in the scale of elevation. It is the popular supposition that the loftiest of the remarkable volcanoes which have helped to build up the Mexican plateau is Popocatepetl, the giant cone the vision of whose snow-cap has attracted so many tourists to the City of Mexico. Humboldt, by means of angles taken from the side of Pueblo, determined the height of this mountain to be 17,674 feet, or, allowing for the corrections pointed out by his friend Oltmanns, 17,713 feet; and this figure has very generally been adopted by geographers to the present time. Professor Heilprin's barometric readings, computed from data obtained at the Central Meteorological Observatory of the City of Mexico and from simultaneous sea-level observations made at Vera Cruz, indicate elevations respectively of 17,513 and 17,533 feet, or a deficiency, as compared with Humboldt's figures, of some 150 to 200 feet. But the interesting fact is pointed out that while geographers and cartographers, even those of Mexican nationality, almost unreservedly accept Humboldt's determinations and figures, they have failed to make the correction which the levelling of the Mexican Railroad necessitates. The height of the plain of Tetimba (1,234 *toises*), which formed the base of Humboldt's measurements, was obtained barometrically, as was likewise that of the City of Mexico; and for the latter Humboldt found a value of 7,470 feet, instead of 7,347, or an excess of 123 feet. With the reduction of this amount, the commonly accepted figures show a marked correspondence with those determined in the spring of this year by Prof. Heilprin.

—As regards the height of the supposed "second" mountain of the Republic, Citlaltepetl, the "star mountain," or, as it is generally known, the Peak of Orizaba, a much greater discrepancy between earlier and later measurements exists. Ferrer, in 1796, determined trigonometrically the height of this almost perfect cone to be 17,879 feet, but Humboldt, from a low-angle measurement taken from near the town of Jalapa, obtained only 17,375 feet. It is this measurement, and a subsequent one (1877) made by Plowes, Rodriguez, and Vigil, representing an official Mexican commission, which have been considered sufficient to relegate Orizaba to the second place among Mexican mountains. The later measurement allows for the height of the mountain 17,664 feet. Humboldt, with characteristic caution, however, rejects his own measurement in favor of the earlier one of Ferrer, believing Orizaba to be the peer of Popocatepetl, and his view has been impressed upon the charts of German geographers generally. Prof. Heilprin and his associates made the fatiguing ascent of the mountain on the 6th and 7th of April, ten days before the ascent of Popocatepetl, and determined the crest to be nearly 700 feet higher than that of the supposed loftiest mountain of Mexico, or 18,205 feet above the level of the Gulf of Mexico. This result agrees closely with one obtained a few years since by Dr. Kaska, by means of a mercurial barometer, whose value is given in 'Meyer's Konversations-Lexikon' as 5,500 metres (18,045 feet).

—The restoration of the Peak of Orizaba to the first place among Mexican volcanoes, and its increased altitude, open up the interesting question as to what constitutes the culminating point of the North American Continent. The only other mountain that need be considered in this connection is St. Elias, situated approximately on the 141st parallel of west longitude, whose summit is claimed for the possessions of both Great Britain and the United States (Alaska). Measurements of this peak vary to an extent of 6,000 feet or more, or between limits of some 13,000 and 19,000 feet. It appears on the British Admiralty charts with 14,970 feet, whereas in the reports of the United States Coast Survey for 1875 the mountain is credited with 19,464 feet, in accordance with a vertical-circle determination made the year previous by Assistant W. H. Dall. Other measurements by the same investigator gave 19,956 and 18,033 feet, thus allowing for an extreme error of upwards of 1,900 feet; all earlier measurements give less than 18,000 feet. It is difficult to explain the broad range of these determinations except on the assumption that the angles of measurement were in most cases too small to permit of accurate values being drawn from them, or that the position of the mountain has not yet been correctly plotted. Several of the early charts place the summit considerably to the east of the 141st parallel, or within what is now British territory, and two or more miles either to the north or to the south of the position given to it by the United States surveyors. The expedition which has been recently organized under the auspices of the United States Topographical Department, with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a view to determining the topography of the region about Mount St. Elias, will probably resolve the question of position and height. For the present it looks as if the mountain were to take second place among the giants of the North American Continent, falling probably but little behind the lofty beacon of the Gulf of Mexico, the Peak of Orizaba.

STANLEY AFTER EMIN.—I.

In Darkest Africa, or the Quest, Rescue, and Retreat of Emin, Governor of Equatoria. By Henry M. Stanley. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Two vols., 8vo.

MR. STANLEY'S book is in some respects as remarkable as the undertaking of which it is the record. It is not what would ordinarily be termed an entertaining work, and if the reader expects to find in it a constant succession of thrilling incidents and vivid pictures of strange life and scenery, he will be disappointed. It is, for the most part, a plain, straightforward official report of the manner in which an expedition was conducted to its successful issue. Numerous details are accordingly to be found in it, proper enough in a report, but likely to prove wearisome to the general reader. There are, it is true, some digressions, and not a few places in which Mr. Stanley seems to be thinking aloud, as it were, and long descriptive passages, notably of the great forest and the snow-clad mountain range; but he is generally too intent on telling his story to turn aside often to seek for dramatic incidents or curious accounts of native customs, just as in the forest his one purpose was, not to explore nor to collect specimens, but to press forward to the lake.

His work also suffers, from a purely literary point of view, in having been written with almost unprecedented rapidity and at a white heat. In his characteristic and touching closing passages he tells us that it took him but fifty days to write these thousand pages—a feat so well-nigh inconceivable to the German mind that a prominent member of the General Staff has recently publicly charged him with having written the account of his travels beforehand. Naturally one sees numerous signs of haste, in harsh and unfinished sentences, in confused statements, and occasionally in errors. Some things are said which had better have been left unsaid, and certain bombastic and overstrained passages, doubtless, would have been cancelled had there been time for revision.

On the other hand, we have never read a book more thoroughly pervaded with the personality of the author. He does not offensively obtrude himself, but he is first, the one in whom all action and interest centres, because it is impossible that it should be otherwise. At times he writes with singular clearness and force, the conversations being especially well reported, and although he now and then expresses himself with almost brutal frankness, yet the unprejudiced reader cannot but feel that he is striving to be scrupulously fair in his judgments. There is also at times a true dignity in his language, when there comes over him a sense of the importance of his mission and the weight of the responsibilities laid upon him. The reader recognizes then that he has no longer to do with a paid newspaper correspondent in search of adventures, but with one who has been nominated by the world to do a certain work, and who is conscious of the power and the will to do it. One scarcely knows which to admire most, the skill with which the expedition was led, and the persistent determination with which all obstacles to its success were overcome, or the extraordinary influence which the leader had over his native followers, the patience and tact with which he treated them, and his deep sympathy for them in their sufferings. Mr. Stanley's weakness, however, as well as his strength, is reflected in his book as in a mirror. He makes far too little allowance for the inexperience of his officers, in criticising their failures to carry out his commands. His frequent sarcastic references to the ideal Pasha are not in good taste, and are unworthy of him, while one is tempted to believe, from the repeated allusions to it, that he regards as the most extraordinary single event of the expedition the sending back his personal baggage.

The opening chapters, treating of the organization of the expedition and its transport from Zanzibar to the head of steam navigation on the Aruwimi, contain little that is worthy of note. In order to understand clearly the reasons for Mr. Stanley's course from this point, it is necessary to keep in mind that the immediate object of the expedition was to carry ammunition to Emin Pasha, who was supposed to be in imminent danger of capture by the Mahdists. The delay of a single day in bringing relief, accordingly, was to be avoided, if possible, and no small part of his trials during the next ten months was the torturing anxiety lest he should be too late. The boats on the Congo not being sufficient to take the whole expedition at once to Yambuya, he determined to divide it, marching himself directly with a picked force, and leaving the remainder under the command of Maj. Barttelot, to follow as soon as all had been brought up the river and the carriers promised by Tippu Tib, the noted Arab freebooter, had arrived. On June 28, 1887, this advance body, consisting of 389 men, including six Europeans, began its march through the absolutely unknown region which lay between them and the lake, five hundred miles distant. Judging from his previous experience in Africa, he believed that the journey would take eighty days. He prefaces his account of the forest in which for one hundred and sixty days they marched, "without ever having seen a bit of greensward of the size of a cottage chamber floor," with these quaint words: "Beseeching the reader's patience, I promise to be as little tedious as possible, though there is no other manuscript or missal, printed book or pamphlet, this spring of the year of our Lord 1890, that contains any account of this region of horrors other than this book of mine." Mr. Stanley writes in such a sophomoric style when he deliberately sets himself to describe this forest that he is only indifferently successful in conveying the impression which it made upon him to his readers. As a matter of fact, it does not appear to have differed from all other tropical and primeval forests. Many travellers have given similar descriptions of the infinite variety of trees, some standing, some fallen, all "lashed together by millions of vines, creepers, and giant convolvuli, until a perfect tangle has been formed and sunshine quite shut out, except a little flickering dust of light here and there to tell you that the sun is out in the sky"; of the birds in the tree-tops, unseen, "though their whistlings, warblings, screamings, and hootings were heard everywhere," and the "countless armies" of insects, and of the sudden rustle in the jungle as some animal, an elephant or a buffalo, hastens away from the approaching caravan. With all this we are familiar. But the unexpected vastness of this Congo forest, which occupies, conjecturally, a "compact square area of 321,057 square miles," very nearly the area of Great Britain, Ireland, and France; its constant gloom and the ignorance of the natives of any other conditions ("Do they not all say that all the world is covered with trees and thick bush?" exclaimed the Zanzibari porters in their despair, as if their memory even of grass and sunshine was but a delusion); the ceaseless danger from foes lurking behind every tree, from cunningly contrived pitfalls, poisoned skewers in the paths, and, above all, the ever-threatening famine—as we read of all this it is impossible to wonder at the profound impression made upon Mr. Stanley, who three times in eighteen months passed through this "region of horrors." It was so sparsely habited by "numberless fragments of tribes, who are at war with each other and who live apart from ten to fifty miles," that there are few paths, sometimes none, leading towards the east. In this case a way had to be cut by the advance guard, fifty picked men armed with bill-hook and axe. They had to

"find a path, or, if none can be found, to choose the thinnest portions of the jungle and tunnel through without delay, for it is most fatiguing to stand in a heated atmosphere with a weighty load on the head. If no thinner jungle can be found, then through anything, however impenetrable it may appear; they must be brisk—'chap-chap,' as we say—or an ominous murmur will rise from the impatient carriers behind. . . . Scores of voices would cry out: 'Wherein lies this fellow's merit? Is it all in his stomach? Nay, it is in his wooden back—tut—his head is too big for a scout. He has clearly been used to hoeing. What does the field hand want on the continent? You may see he is only a Banian slave! Nay, he is only a Consul's freed man! Bosh! He is a mission boy!' Their bitter tongues pierce like swords through the armor of stupidity, and the bill-hooks with trenchant edges are wielded most manfully, and the bright, keen axes flash and sever the saplings, or slice a broad strip of bark from a tree, and the bush is pierced, and the jungle gapes open, and fast on their heels continuously close presses the mile-long caravan."

The difficulties of the march were greatly aggravated by the fact that the slave-hunters had eight months before raided the forest settlements. They had not only burned the villages, but

"their rage for destruction had even been vented on the plaintain groves, every canoe on the rivers had been split into pieces, every island had been searched, and into the darkest recesses, whither a slight track could be traced, they had penetrated with only one dominating passion, which was to kill as many of the men and capture as many of the women and children as craft and cruelty would enable them. . . . What these destroyers had left of groves and plantations, of plaintain and bananas, manioc and corn-fields, the elephant, chimpanzee, and monkeys had trampled and crushed into decaying and putrid muck."

From this wanton destruction the whole expedition was more than once in danger of perishing from starvation; wood-beans, berries, and fungi being their only food for many days at a time. They passed through two camps of these "enemies of the human race," leaving in each case many who were too feeble to proceed. Even these the Arabs treated with such inhuman cruelty that Mr. Stanley with difficulty restrained himself from exterminating them on his return.

In the eastern part of the forest the villages were placed in the centre of clearings, sometimes a mile and a half in diameter, in which the fallen trees formed an almost impregnable abatis. The path goes now upon the ground, now upon a giant trunk and along a branch, until the heavily laden carrier is twenty feet above the ground. He

"descends cautiously along the steep slope until he is six feet from the ground from which he must jump on to another tapering branch, and follow that to another height of twenty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feet, then along the monster tree, then down to the ground; and so on for hours, the hot, burning sun, and the close, steamy atmosphere of the clearing forcing the perspiration in streams from his body. I have narrowly escaped death three times during these frightful gymnastic exercises. One man died where he fell. Several men were frightfully bruised. . . . All this, however, is made much harder and more dangerous when, from a hundred points, the deadly arrows are flying from concealed natives, which, thank Heaven, were not common."

It was in this part of the forest and not far from these clearings that the villages of the pygmies were found.

At length, on December 4, the wearied men came out of the forest into the sunshine and the green grass, which was greeted with a rapturous joy not to be expressed in words. As we read Mr. Stanley's account of this scene and of the enthusiastic shouts which, a few days after, the first view of the lake awakened in his followers, we are reminded of the joyous "Thalatta! Thalatta!" with which the Ten Thousand hailed the Euxine. The goal was reached, but not the end of their toils, for nothing could be learned from the natives of the man whom they had come to rescue. Their boat had been left with the Arabs five weeks' journey back in the forest. There was no canoe upon the lake nor a tree upon the shore out of which one could be made. To wait where they were was out of the question. To attempt to march overland to Wadelai, twenty-five days' journey distant, every mile of which might be contested by hostile natives, was equally futile. Evidently there was nothing to be done but to return to a fertile spot just within the forest, to build a fort, to send a force for their boat and then return with it to the lake. Of this cruel disappointment Mr. Stanley writes in a simple and dignified manner which wins our respect and heightens our appreciation of his character. It was cruel because it was wholly unnecessary; for had Emin sent one of his steamers but a nine hours' sail from his southernmost station on the day on which he writes he expects Stanley, he would have found him on the lake shore. His inexplicable remissness, moreover, was the direct occasion of "five days' fighting, a four months' loss of time," and, indirectly, of most of the disasters to the rear guard, including the deaths of Barttelot and Jameson. Not one word of explanation, however, so far as we know, has he yet given.

Obedient to their leader's command, then, the brave band shouldered their burdens again and turned their backs on the lake to reach which they had endured so much. In three weeks they are once more encamped in the corn-fields and banana-groves of Fort Bodo, or the "Peaceful Fort." On April 18 they are again at the lake, Mr. Stanley meantime having had a severe attack of illness. The boat is launched and sent to the nearest station to announce their arrival, and on the 29th they are at length joined by Emin Pasha.

HOGARTH'S ARCHÆOLOGY OF CYPRUS.

Devia Cypria: Notes of an Archæological Journey in Cyprus in 1888. By D. G. Hogarth, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Late Craven Fellow in the University of Oxford. With Map and Illustrations. London: Henry Frowde; New York: Macmillan. 1889.

STUDENTS of to-day are more than ready to accord a hearty welcome to works on any of the various branches of archæological research, and the greeting is sure to be all the more hearty if the book come from the pen of a competent scholar. Concerning Mr. Hogarth's competency for the work of exploration there can be no doubt. He served his apprenticeship in practical field-archæology under Mr. Ramsay in Asia Minor, and was then transferred to Cyprus, where for several years he has been engaged in the excavation of various sites in the island. During his leisure moments he has made journeys to the remotest, and hence least known, corners of the island. The results of these journeys are given to the world in the handsome, but costly, little volume which bears the title given above. While these results are not such as to startle the world, yet they are worth the imparting, even though they be negative in character in the main. A negative result is, after all, a result!

As we should expect, the order of the narrative is geographical, treating first of the Paphos District, then of the Carpass, the long *oxtail* which gets its name from the city of Carpasia, situate on the northeastern sea-front. Lastly, the author gives us a few miscellaneous odds and ends from Central Cyprus.

We have read Mr. Hogarth's book far from our home and study, and we have been much annoyed by his shortcomings in regard to maps. Books of this character should always be accompanied by maps, embodying all the results laid down in the text. Now, nearly half of the book is taken up with a discussion of the Paphos district, and yet we are vouchsafed no map. We are given a map of the Carpass, but it is very unsatisfactory and inaccurate; it omits sites (Vlakhou, p. 93), villages, and mountains, which the author speaks of in the text (on p. 79 there are no less than seven instances of this neglect, viz, Sykadhes, Mesovouni, Aphendrika, Chelones, Agia Pappou [church or village ?] Ἄσπρο νησί and Kiouria in the margin); it frequently gives as a dead level districts which the author tells us are mountainous (pp. 68, 69, 72, *scepe*); it does not hesitate to locate a site on the wrong side of a stream (Nitoviklia, p. 78); we are often at a loss to know whether the author is speaking of village, mountain, or river (Sykadhes, p. 79; Tsambres, pp. 91, 92); lastly, on the map we read "Apostolos Andreas," whereas the author speaks constantly of Cape St. Andreas. Of course every one will understand this last, but then consistency is really a jewel. We wonder at this faulty map, because, as we have said, Mr. Hogarth learned his trade of travelling archæologist in the field in Asia Minor under the tutelage of a painstaking explorer. The world of to-day demands that the travelling archæologist be able to make, and do make, an accurate route survey of the country traversed by him. If we may judge by the map of the Carpass, we feel safe in assuming that Mr. Hogarth has not made a route survey, and we hope that better things may be reported of him in regard to the journey to Asia Minor, upon which, as we understand, he is at this moment absent. His other work Mr. Hogarth has done well.

The kingdom of Paphos was second in importance only to that of Salamis; its boundaries are well defined by nature. The five rivers of the kingdom have cut up the country into as many great cañons, which make travel in the interior difficult, and account for the fact that few travellers have left the coast road. The uplands are fertile and abound in flocks, while the lowlands are easily irrigated. The poverty of the natives is due not to poor soil, but to lack of roads connecting Paphos with the present centres of commerce; but in ancient times, when the port was one of the best in the island, there was not the same need for radiating roads. The extensive ruins of Paphos speak of its former greatness; the temple of Aphrodite was very wealthy and attracted visitors from all the Greek world. The ruins of many other places—Arsinoe, Letymbou, Polemi, Limni, etc.—show that the kingdom was wealthy and populous. Mr. Hogarth speaks of acres of ruins in now uninhabited forest regions. Under the independent kings, when strength of position was desired, Old Paphos, situated ten miles inland, was the capital, but when the island had been united under the Ptolemys, New Paphos gained in importance.

The history of Old Paphos is really the history of the shrine of the Paphian Aphrodite, whose high priests were the kings, as in the Cappadocian Comana, the Golden. The dignity of the shrine and its priesthood continued unimpaired down to Roman times, for the priesthood was conferred upon the last Ptolemy in lieu of royal power. From this time on, New Paphos usurped the political headship, becoming successively the seat of the first bishop of Paphos, the capital of the Lusignans, and later the residence of the Greek prelate. New Paphos in turn fell into decay in Venetian times, and the present town arose nearly a mile inland. In the allusions of the ancient authors to Paphos, there is frequent uncertainty as to which town is meant.

Only five new inscriptions were found at Paphos. Two are in Greek, one of which is very valuable, as it adds a new proconsular governor to Cyprus; two in French, dating from the time of the Latin Kingdom; one in Cypriote on a scarab of the fourth century B. C. The scarab is beautifully engraved, and represents Herakles wrestling with a lion. The Fontana Amorosa of Ariosto, and the fountain at which Aphrodite married Akamas, are to be located at the βρύσις τῶν ἐρωτων, a spot of ideal beauty.

Throughout the book Mr. Hogarth has fault to find with the queer methods of Gen. di Cesnola.

"So much," says he, "has been written and said since the publication of Gen. di Cesnola's book as to numerous inaccuracies and misstatements contained therein, that I almost owe an apology for flogging a dead horse; but several conversations with those who had worked for him shed a (to me) new light on the subject, and showed me the genesis of much that seems mythical in the book. The truth of the matter seems to be that the General seldom directed his excavations in person, and was not present when the treasures were found; he undertook some rapid tours about the island, stopping, for instance, *one day only* at Old Paphos (*cf.* his book, p. 206, 'I superintended excavations there in 1869 for *several months*'), but his collection was amassed by the labors of his dragoman Beshbesh, both by excavation and by purchase in the villages and in the bazaars of the towns, etc."

At Marathounda Mr. Hogarth found a Greek inscription dedicating some ex-voto offering to Apollo Μυρτάτης; previously he had found at Amargetti and published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* an inscription in honor of Apollo Μελάνθιος. To this latter epithet he gave a local signification, and argued that it was an ethnic for a village Melantha, or something of the sort. He now retracts this conjecture, and substitutes therefor the theory that μυρτάτης and μελάνθιος are epithets of Apollo as the Healer by the virtues of herbs, the former meaning Apollo "of the myrtle," and the latter "of the poppy," just as other epithets of Apollo have reference to the vegetable kingdom. So the Cyprian ὑλάτης is Apollo "of the grove," the Lesbian μυρικαῖος "of the tamarisk." Analogous is the Cyprian Aphrodite μυκηρόδις, "of the almond tree." Dioscorides dwells upon the medicinal virtues of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the melanthium and the myrtle, both of which are effective in disorders of the urinary organs. Now it is noteworthy that at Amargetti, the seat of Apollo Μελάνθιος, phalli, both on statuettes and cones, were found, which no doubt were votive offerings dedicated as tokens of gratitude for cures effected. Mr. Hogarth's theory is thus made very plausible.

There is reason to doubt the genuineness of the Cypriote inscriptions from Drimu published by Beaudouin and Pottier in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1879, p. 347. By means of a Cypriote inscription, a temple of Hera is located at the church of Agia Moni. A bad copy of this inscription by Vondiziano was published by Deecke (in *Beiträge*, etc., xi), but he could not be certain of the last two lines. From Hogarth's copy, impression, and photograph it becomes quite clear that the last words are:

ta · i · te · o · i · ta · e · ra · i · =

τᾷ θεῷ τᾷ Ἥρᾳ.

It is interesting to find a temple dedicated to Hera in a part of the island sacred to Aphrodite; moreover, the ruins prove that the shrine was one of importance. This inscription is valuable from another point of view, since it contains a new symbol, for which, on not very good grounds, the value *jo* is suggested.

The mediæval settlement of Aschelia is in the centre of the sugar-growing plain of Cyprus; it formed part of the Domain Royal, and was assigned to the Hospitallers, who established a commandery there. The large church of the wretched hamlet of to-day contained, at the time of Mr. Hogarth's visit, a pulpit and baldachino of wood, elaborately carved and decorated. They are both Renaissance in character, with marked signs of Gothic influence, and must be assigned to the beginning of the sixteenth century, since the Hospitallers were expelled by the Turkish invaders about the middle of that century. A Mr. Williamson has purchased and brought to England all these carvings, but their ultimate destination is not known.

Monoliths, commonly called πέτραι τρυπημέναι, have been explained by most travellers as in some way connected with a phallic worship. The stones are conical in shape, and vary much in size; the colossal ones at Paphos are eleven feet high, while the smallest at Agios Photios is only four feet high. Mr. Hogarth knows of no less than fifty such stones. He follows Dr. Guillemard in the view that they have nothing whatever to do with religion, but are the remains of ancient presses. The usual adjuncts of many of these monoliths bear out this view, as does also Conder's ('Heth and Moab,' pp. 253-4) description of the menhirs of Moab. Mr. Hogarth found that mysterious virtues, phallic or otherwise, were rarely attributed to these stones by the peasants, and when such belief did exist, it was found to be so weak that he argues that the belief is of modern origin and has not yet crystallized into an article of universal faith.

The name Carpass is ancient, but of obscure origin. The Carpass has wonderfully varied scenery. The climate is un-Cyprian, for the cool air from two seas sweeps over it to temper the heat. The peasants themselves are un-Cypriote in appearance, and may be descendants of the Veneziani bianchi who settled in Cyprus after the first crusade. They are distinguished for industry and thrift, and, as their country is inaccessible, they have escaped the direst oppression; the traveller is consequently impressed with their prosperity, good government, good order, and native civilization. Mr. Hogarth gives a short outline of the history of the Carpass, borrowing his facts from the 'Histoire de l'Île de Chypre' by De la Mas Latrie.

The ruins of Salamis are chaotic. What is above ground is mostly late, but excavations might bring to light the foundations of the temples of Zeus Salaminius and of Athena Pronoia. Χρεοφύλαξ (p. 64) is not a new word.

Inscription No. 18, p. 65, locates the Cyprian Cnidus, the birthplace of the historian Ctesias. It is now a wilderness of formless heaps. Excavation would not be profitable, save only in the tombs, because the rock lies near the surface. The great stone enclosure with upright menhir, or emblem of fertility, is a Phœnician relic, and "must depend for its explanation on that assigned to its fellows all over the world" (*cf.* Conder: 'Syrian Stone Lore,' p. 43 ff., and 'Heth and Moab,' p. 237).

The ruins of Mazaraes are large in area and are probably, though not certainly, of early origin, but the name and history of the town which once stood there are no doubt for ever lost. At Peristefani, a site small in area, but strong in position, Mr. Hogarth found a number of torsos and legs of statues of a very early period that recalled the more archaic Dali figurines.

The great rock-cut tombs of Elisis and Galinoporni are remarkable both for size and position, the former being high up on a sheer bluff, and excavated out of the solid rock for eighty-seven feet of horizontal depth, besides numerous sides chambers. Both tombs served as the final resting-places for the royal family that reigned at the ancient site at Agia Varvara and Nitoviklia. Both of these sites probably represent one and the same city, Nitoviklia being the more ancient.

At the Carpasian Islands there is a slip for launching ships; no doubt there was a corresponding slip at Carpasia, on the northern coast, though no traces of it are visible to-day. Mr. Hogarth suggests that the ancient mariners drew their vessels across this neck of land to avoid the dangers attendant upon the passage round the Cape.

Nothing worthy of mention was found at the site of the Temple of Aphrodite Acraea or at the Kleides Islands. Both Urania and Carpasia are located tentatively, though the site of Carpasia seems to be plain enough, a square mile being strewn with remains of a late period; the tombs alone bear evidence of a greater antiquity. Aphrodisium is located by inference, no doubt correctly, at Iastrika. A sumptuous royal tomb was discovered at Davlos, with colonnades of the pure Doric order.

The views from both Buffavento and Troodos are famed, but, in Mr. Hogarth's opinion, they cannot compare in this respect with Kantara Castle, which dominates the northeastern end of Cyprus and sweeps two seas.

Makaria is a mere wilderness of rubble, but with many graves still unrifled. Here Mr. Hogarth noted a kind of sarcophagus common in some parts of Asia Minor, viz., the grave sunk into the living rock, and covered with the ordinary sarcophagus lid.

The third division of Mr. Hogarth's book relates to central Cyprus; it covers only a few pages, but it is valuable. We see no reason for his extreme diffidence in suggesting that modern Mari is the site of ancient Marium. At Larnaca-tis-Lapithou Mr. Hogarth copied inscription No. 2779 of Le Bas-Waddington, and assured himself that the stone has τοῦ Ναρν[α]κίου, *not* Λαρν[α]κίου. From this fact he argues that Larnaca is not an ancient name. We do not agree with him; the change of *n* to *l* is by no means an unknown phenomenon. Even granting this change, the name would still be ancient. To deny antiquity to a name so slightly corrupted would be to rob the geographer of a fruitful means of identifying and locating ancient towns. We might multiply instances *ad infinitum*, but we take at random Sagalassus and Aghlasun; Konana and Guïnen; Anabura and Enevre. These pairs of names do not look much alike, it is true, but the geographer who fails to read the ancient name out of its modern corruption is not fit for his work.

One of the most interesting of the thirty-six inscriptions is that of Sergius Paulus at Soli, already published, but badly, by Gen. Cesnola. The date of the inscription seems to be 55 A. D., or, in other words, ten years after St. Paul's visit to the island (see Acts of the Apostles xiii., 4-13).

The book closes with a list of proconsular governors of Cyprus.

WHISTLER'S OWN.

The Gentle Art of Making Enemies: As pleasingly exemplified in many instances, wherein the serious ones of this earth, carefully exasperated, have been prettily spurred on to unseemliness and indiscretion, while overcome by an undue sense of right. New York: John W. Lovell Co. 1890.

Mr. Whistler's own edition of 'The Gentle Art of Making Enemies' is at last before us. It is a much larger book than Mr. Sheridan Ford's "spurious and garbled version," but the difference in size is largely a matter of paper and type, for, although it contains considerable matter not given by Mr. Ford, it omits a good deal given by him. In what is common to the two volumes the variations are slight and, for the most part, unimportant; and, judging from internal evidence, one would be inclined to think that what "garbling" has been done is rather Mr. Whistler's work than Mr. Ford's. In the affair of the "Claimant of Lemon Yellow," for instance, all mention of the names of either Mr. Mortimer Menpes himself or of Mr. Ford is carefully suppressed. Mr. Ford's name, indeed, is nowhere mentioned in the volume, and the impression is attempted to be given that his edition of Mr. Whistler's writings was not only published without the author's consent, but prepared without his knowledge. Mr. Ford's real crime would seem to be, not the alteration of what Mr. Whistler had written, but the republication of certain things that the writer has the grace to be a little ashamed of. The book certainly gains in dignity by the omission of the controversy with Theodore Child, in which the bludgeon rather than the rapier was the weapon employed, and of the unsavory squabble with Mr. Stott of Oldham, while it loses little in brilliancy. Enough remains to show clearly the undeniable wit, the amazing impudence, the boundless vanity, the skilful irrelevance, and the ingenuity in putting an antagonist in the wrong which make Mr. Whistler's letters such amusing reading, and render them so annoying to their victims. The volume closes with a delicious piece of bouffe—Whistler burlesqued by himself! He had written a letter to the *Scots Observer* which contained a "regret that the ridiculous Romeike has not hitherto sent me your agreeable literature." This called out an angry letter from Romeike & Curtice, demanding an apology under threat of prosecution, to which Mr. Whistler thus responds:

"Sir—If it be not actionable, permit me to say that you *really are delightful!!*

"*Naïveté*, like yours, I have never met—even in my long experience with all those, some of whose 'agreeable literature' may be, I suppose, in the 807 cuttings you charge me for.

"Who, in Heaven's name, ever dreamed of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you as an actual person?—or one whom one would mean to insult?

"My good Sir, no such intention—believe me—did I, in my wildest moments, ever entertain.

"*Your* scalp—if you have such a thing—is safe enough!—and I even think—however great my willingness to assist you—could not possibly appear in the forthcoming Edition."

So impertinent in his vanity as to doubt of the existence of that "scalp" which, yet, he is so vain of his impertinence as duly to ticket in his collection—the combination is almost sublime!

The book, however, contains other and more important additions than this, or than the famous and amusing "Catalogue of Etchings and Dry-points," otherwise it would hardly be worth a separate review. These additions are the pamphlet on the Whistler-Ruskin trial called "Art and Art Critics," the "Ten o'Clock," and several shorter papers—"Propositions," etc.—which, collectively, may be assumed to contain Mr. Whistler's serious ideas on art and criticism; and the printing of them here lends a certain respectability—an air of reasoned intention—even to his Indian warfare upon his critics. Mr. Whistler is an artist of great talents and considerable achievement. Whatever one may think of the slighter productions which he occasionally exhibits, one must admit the universally recognized merit of his better work. He has, moreover, a following of enthusiastic disciples. His serious opinions upon art and criticism are therefore worth notice. The artist who boasts that he "never explains" has a somewhat oracular and mysterious style, and it is not always easy to be sure that one knows what he means, but we will do our best.

The best known of his opinions is that of the uselessness of critics. "Harm they do, and not good," he says, and again: "Let work, then, be received in silence, as it was in the days to which the penmen still point as an era when Art was at its apogee." He ridicules the pretensions of the critic to "do good to Art," and tells him that as "the best work was done when he was not there to help it," so art can get on without him in the future. Here, we think, though it would make him smile to tell him so, Mr. Whistler takes the critics altogether too seriously. Are there any of the breed yet extant who think they can "do good to art"? Do any of them still imagine that they can either correct the artist's faults or aid him to attain to merits yet unaccomplished? It is not so that we understand our humble office. Has not Mr. Howells assured us, in the last *Harper's Monthly*, that "journalism is criticism, the criticism of life"? Just so the art critic is the reporter of art. His mission is not to the artist, but to the public. His function is to write of what the public cares to read about. All he gives the artist is publicity, and most artists understand this so well that his silence they resent more than his bitterest attacks. Mr. Whistler asks that his work "be received in silence," but probably no living man would less like to be taken at his word. This is an age of printing; and what the people are interested in, that they will read about. By all means let us ask for good criticism rather than bad; by all means let us condemn ignorance and assumption, but to wish for the extinction of all criticism is to wish for the cessation of all popular interest in art.

This step, also, Mr. Whistler is apparently ready to take. He assures the people that they need not trouble themselves about art, that they have "nothing to say in the matter," and never had. "Art happens." "The master stands in no relation to the moment at which he occurs." "There never was an artistic period. There never was an Art-loving nation." Therefore he would "lift from their shoulders this incubus of Art." But if it is unimportant that the people should know anything of art, why deliver "ten o'clocks" and write pamphlets to instruct them therein? If the people need take no interest in art, who is to buy the pictures and how is the artist to live?

These are the greatest of Mr. Whistler's paradoxes, and the only ones in which he is wholly wrong; but even when he is partly right he is full of paradox and over-statement. In his preaching of "art for art's sake," as opposed to subject-painting or mere imitation, there is much that is true; but he carries it to extremes. "Take the picture of my mother," he says, "exhibited at the Royal Academy as an 'Arrangement in Gray and Black.' Now that is what it is." Surely not. That the "arrangement" of color is a great and important element in the art no one can deny, but if there were no more than that, why paint a portrait at all? It may be true that the public ought not to "care about the identity of the portrait"; but it *does* care about the rendering of human character and always will, which is why we care more for a portrait by Titian than for a handsome rug. Let Mr. Whistler say what he will, the *musical* element in painting, though a great one, is *only* an element, and painting does aim not only to please, but to *represent*.

We have tried to treat these opinions seriously, but, after all, are they the serious opinions of an artist upon art? Or are they only a part of that ingenious self-advertisement of which Mr. Whistler is past-master, intended not to instruct, but to draw attention? One has an uneasy suspicion that to take him in earnest is "to consider too curiously," and that perhaps the best answer to him would be, "*Blagueur, va!*"

THE KOREAN LANGUAGE.

I. *An Introduction to the Korean Spoken Language.* II. *A Concise Dictionary of the Korean Language.* Korean-English and English-Korean. By Horace Grant Underwood. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 2 vols., pp. 939.

THE three great divisions in which all the languages may be classified according to their expression in written symbol are the ideographic, the syllabic, and the alphabetic. The Chinese written character is a logogram, or, less properly, an ideogram, like that of the Egyptian, Hittite, or Aztec. The Japanese and Cherokee tables of letters are syllabaries. In order to express to the Chinese eyes foreign names, such, for instance, as Blaine and Cleveland, the scholar in Peking selects a certain number of characters, and, writing them in vertical line, makes approach to the true sound, very much as the diagram of a cat, an ass, and a trophy could be read "catastrophe." When the Japanese editors wished to inform their readers of the results of the nominating conventions of 1884, they published the names of *Boo-rā-n* and *Kee ree-boo-ran-do*. The Japanese table of letters is a syllabary like the Cherokee.

The Koreans possess a true alphabet, one of the simplest, easiest, and, for its purpose, probably the best in the world. As the Phœnician, or modified Egyptian, was probably the mother of the alphabets of the western world, so from the Sanskrit writing, carried by the Buddhist missionaries all over that part of Asia dominated by Chinese culture, have sprung alphabets or syllabaries in which literature for the common people could be written. Both by the evidence of parallel columns and by the statement of a Korean author, the native alphabet is based on the Sanskrit forms. Eight initial, eight final, and eleven middle characters comprise the alphabet of twenty-five letters, eleven vowels and fourteen consonants. Simple as is this alphabet, we doubt the statement of Mr. John Ross, that "half an hour's study is sufficient to master it"—unless one is a born linguist—and we prefer Mr. Underwood's direction to give at least a day to it. In his two volumes he very properly does not transliterate, but expects the student to master the sounds and proceed at once to use the vocabulary as written in Korean, for the work is an introduction to the *spoken* language only.

Spelling in Korea is purely phonetic, but the spelling-reformers of our own country who would find there the realization of their hopes, will be sadly disappointed. For even with an alphabet as faithful to the spoken word as Pitman's phonography, Korea is an awful example of license. The orthography, or rather cacography, in the native books is simply anarchy; for each man is a law unto himself. No two men spell alike, nor are two pages of the same author always uniform. This, however, may arise from the fact that native scholars utterly neglect the literary culture of Korean, and compose only in Chinese or Asiatic Latin. Even the Japanese, with only a syllabary, possess order and beauty of spelling unknown in Chō-sen. In addition to these difficulties besetting the learner, euphony plays curious tricks, changing the initial consonants of postpositions and suffixes. This phenomenon is so marked as to lead the French missionaries to arrange for nouns, which in reality have no inflections, five distinct declensions with eleven cases each.

Mr. Underwood has lived in Séoul, the Korean capital, since 1883, and has learned the language by close personal contact with all classes, from Cabinet Minister to street laborer. He disclaims having written a systematic grammar, but in reality he has produced one of the best specimens of the exposition of an Asiatic language according to the best modern methods. It is the height of absurdity to make Latin the norm of comparison and procedure, as do the scholars of southern Europe, or to take up space in pointing out the contrasts or resemblances to Hebrew, as the northern European of theological training is so apt to do. Wisely Mr. Underwood examines the Korean first by entering within and making plain its main points and lines; then, approaching it from the English idiom and structure, he shows how the foreigner can make use of it in conversation. His work is really a neat, clear, and simple grammar, with a concise dictionary of the most needful words. While to students who expect to really master the tongue of Chō-sen, the larger grammar and bulkier dictionary of the French missionaries published at Yokohama in 1881 are indispensable, the present pair of volumes is extremely serviceable for counter, desk, pocket, and library. The print is large, clear, and neat, the press-work well done, the paper good, and the binding excellent. The Seishi Bunsha of Yokohama, Japan, has turned out no better mechanical work, and the proof-reading, having been done on the spot by the author and his assistant, Mr. A. Stewart Annand, the pages are notably free from those misprints which so afflict the beginner. A small list of errata is inserted in each volume.

Structurally, Korean is as unlike Chinese as Hebrew is unlike English. Even the avalanches of Chinese words and phrases which have at various epochs rolled into the Korean, have swollen its vocabulary, but left only su-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perficial traces upon its syntax. Just as Latin has at different times entered and reëntered English in original and in mediate or modified forms, so has the Asiatic Latin influenced the speech of the peninsula. To-day the talk of the official class, the educated man, the student, consists so largely of Chinese terms that to the ear of the commercial foreigner there seem to be two languages. Beeween the "official" and the "coolie" of whom Mr. Underwood speaks, there is even more difference of understanding than between the "low" and "high" German of the raw recruit and the Prussian officer. Yet during all the two thousand years or so of Chinese culture in Chō-sen, the native syntax has retained its integrity. It may be noted, however, that, as in Japan, most of the Chinese terms borrowed have been taken from the books. Hence even the speech of the Koreans has been influenced by the terse written language of China, so that usually the Korean speaks with laconic conciseness. Nor can a Chinese and Korean speak together in conversation unaided by pencil and paper; for, in addition to the Korean's retaining his idiom, his Chinese vocabulary, like that of the Japanese, is, from a modern standard, mispronounced Chinese. The pronunciation of Chinese in China fluctuates from age to age, since no syllabary, alphabet, or trustworthy apparatus of rhymes has fixed the ancient sounds; while in Korea and Japan such a phonograph or registry has existed. As to sound, it is probable that more ancient Chinese or Asiatic Latin is heard in the neighbor countries than in the Middle Kingdom.

When, however, the Japanese wishes to learn Korean, his work is almost exclusively one of pronunciation and vocabulary, for the structure and idiom of both languages are almost the same as peas inside the same pod. Not only do the Japanese interpreters write interlinear translations of Korean sentences, proclamations, and books, word for word, and particle for particle, but to the foreigner familiar with Japanese the close resemblance in structure is almost ludicrous. The Catholic priests in Japan in the sixteenth century were able in a few weeks to understand at the confessional the talk of the converted Korean captives who, on the string of their vernacular syntax, soon threaded a new rosary of words. In the northwest provinces this close resemblance may be less manifest.

Like the languages of northeastern Asia, the Korean is poverty-stricken in imagination and the faculty of personification. Each word is a stamped coin worth only its face value, not a counter covering a wealth of thought beyond what meets the ear. Those vital ornaments which are to language what the traits of genius are to men and women—gender, number, person, and case—are, broadly speaking, absent. The native grammarians seem quite right in naming but three parts of speech — nouns, verbs, and particles. There are no true pronouns nor any real adjectives. Our prepositions are postpositions, and our conjunctions are rendered into Korean by particles, nouns, verbal moods, and the participial forms of adjectives and verbs. Nouns are made to do duty as pronouns and verbs as adjectives. He would be a courageous Korean who should try to translate Shakspere into his vernacular. To render Shelley into Korean would be a task to which the hunting of their own tigers must be remunerative and highly successful sport.

In this first fruit of American scholarship in the Land of Morning Calm, Mr. Underwood has made a contribution of the first order of value in the acquisition of the spoken language. He has been assisted by Prof. Homer B. Hulbert of the Royal Korean University, another fellow-American, by James S. Gale, A.B., and by Son Soun Yong, a cultivated native. The work fitly crowns the labors of scholarship in which Klaproth, Medhurst, Siebold, Ross, Aston, and the French missionaries have borne a share, and in the acquisition of which not only the brave soldiers of the cross from France, but also Thomas of Scotland and Mayers of England have perished as martyrs. The day of the complete Bible in idiomatic Korean should not now be far distant.

THE LATEST YEAR BOOKS.

Year Books of the Reign of King Edward the Third. Years xiv and xv. Edited and Translated by Luke Owen Pike. [Rolls Series.] London. 1889. Pp. lxxv, 424.

THE filling of the gaps in our black-letter Year Books goes on slowly. The present volume was, indeed, published seven or eight months ago, but the interval between this and the last preceding one was over a year. Mr. Pike's editing continues to be marked by a sort of research and accuracy which classical scholars have long expected and exhibited in their work, but which lawyers have known little of until recent years. Whatever there is in Fitzherbert or the Book of Assises that may illustrate these reports, now for the first time printed, has been consulted; the original records of the cases here given have been searched, wherever they could be found; and the text of the reports has been settled upon a study of several of the best manuscripts. The editor remarks upon the fact that there are sometimes many independent manuscript reports of the same case, and adds an important observation:

"Some of the cases . . . in the present volume appear in Fitzherbert's Abridgment in a form differing considerably from that in which they occur in any of the MSS. above mentioned. This fact is a confirmation of the suggestion previously made that there was not any reporter whose authority was generally recognized, or that if there was, he had many rivals who were not without patrons in the legal profession. It seems that reporting was an open profession, and that some judges and counsel possessed reports in one form, others in other forms."

The cases in this volume seem to be mostly of small importance. Of most interest is the one which recites the proceedings upon the arraignment of Willoughby, a late Chief-Justice, one of the numerous officials who were brought up before the special commissions to which the anger and jealousy of Edward gave rise upon his return from France in 1340. Willoughby was charged, merely upon "the clamor of the people," with maladministration of various sorts. It may gratify the reader's curiosity, and it will serve to show the style of these reports, to quote a part of this case in the original French:

"R. Wilby fust arene devant PARN. SAD. et SCOT. [Parning, Sadington, and Scot,] Justices a ceo faire, qe vient en garde de macers.—PARN. lui dit coment le Roy, affiaunt soveraynement en sa leaute et sen, lui fist son lieutenant en sa place demene, quant il passa la mier, et coment puis il avoit bestourne et vendi les leys com boefe ou vache, dount par clamour de poeple pardecea et de la chose est moustre a Roi. Par quei vous orrez nostre commission et ceo qe homme vous dirra.—Et la commission lieu doier et terminer, etc. *Wilby* dit qil fust mestre en la pluis haut place de la terre, par quei de trespas fait illoeques en place pluis bas il ne deivent conustre.—PARN. Derrour en tiele chose vous dites verite; mes si vous eiez trespase au Roi vous respondrez ou lui plerra.—*Wilby.* Le Roi ne voet estre resceu sans [estre] apris par enditement ou par suyte de partie atache par plegge.—PARN. Il est apris par clamour de poeple.—*Wilby* ad conseil par liveré de COURT."

Several "bills" (*plusours billes*) were then read, not "affirmed by pledges" and without "suit," two from the commonalties of the counties of Nottingham and of Lancaster, and another from a certain Knight, to which, as they were read, Willoughby is reported as answering briefly. He was charged with taking gifts, which he denied. He was also charged with allowing a petit jury to sit in a criminal case without having any of the indictors on it. That, he answered, was the Sheriff's fault. Parning replied, "Certes, si enditours ne y soient, il nest bien pur le Roi." (This practice of placing or retaining some of the Grand Jury upon the petit jury was not abolished until about ten years later, by 25 Ed. 3., Stat. 5, c. 3.) A little further on, Willoughby remarks: "It is the custom for the justice to go to the indictors de les conforter et enformer." At the end, "Willoughby threw himself on the King's mercy, because he would not plead with his liege lord. The Lord of Wake [one of the Commission] said to him that this was the wisest plea that Willoughby ever pleaded. . . . And afterwards the King caused him to be led from one county to another," etc.

The editor's "Introduction" is mainly taken up with instructive comments upon the legal and constitutional situation in England during the period covered by these reports. The key to this situation lay in the pressure to get money from an unwilling people, to carry on the King's wars. The King traded off the old Presentment of Englishry for other sources of revenue, and made other concessions to his subjects. But still money was lacking, and he was unsuccessful abroad; he returned in November, 1340, angry and suspicious, and proceeded to issue a quantity of commissions to overhaul "almost the whole field of the English body politic and social." As to the nature of these commissions the editor has a learned consideration. The King also got into a lively quarrel with the ecclesiastics. But the storm soon blew over, and the judges, including Willoughby, were restored to their places. "It is by no means impossible that the somewhat abortive ending of all the commissions which had issued may have been to a very considerable extent due to clerical influence."

This "Introduction" is well worthy the attention of students of constitutional history. Peculiarly interesting is the account of the proceedings relating to the making and the repeal of the ordinance of Northampton. "The Chancellor, however, and Treasurer and some of the justices protested that they did not assent to the making or to the form of the statutes, and that they could not observe the statutes if contrary to the laws and usages of the realm which they were sworn to keep." Within a year the King, in "Letters Close" to the sheriffs of all the counties in England, repudiated the statute, reciting these protests and that he agreed to the statute only for fear Parliament would break up without doing anything, wherefore "we . . . did dissemble, as beseemed us," etc. Parliament afterwards agreed to this, but even in this agreement, as Mr. Pike remarks, "there appears a recognition of the right of the justices to pronounce whether a proposed statute was in accordance with the laws and usages of the realm, and, consequently, whether it ought to become operative as a statute. . . . The persons who had to administer the law were supposed to be entitled to a real, and not merely a nominal, hearing in the making of laws." It will be remembered by stu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dents of our American law that ideas of this sort found expression in some of our early constitutional conventions, and were actually embodied in some of the early constitutions.

It is greatly to be wished that this excellent enterprise, so honorable to the British Government, of completing the early reports, should be more rapidly pushed forward. If the gratitude of legal scholars for what they have already had in this kind, a hearty appreciation of the method and thoroughness with which the work is done, and an eager desire for more, might avail to induce the British Treasury to give these much-needed volumes to the world considerably faster, then we might confidently expect that result. As it is we can only wish and beg for it.

The Village Community. By George Laurence Gomme. [The Contemporary Science Series.] Scribner & Welford. 1890.

THE aim of this essay is so exclusively controversial as to make it an improper selection for a series presumably intended to be of a popular character. It is a scientific treatise in so far as it illustrates the methods by which the advances of science are made, but not in the sense of containing a body of established truths. The author himself, with all his enthusiasm, would not claim that his theories were demonstrated, and they will certainly be opposed by men as competent as he to form a judgment.

The first proposition which Mr. Gomme endeavors to establish is that the village community is not an institution peculiar to the Aryan race. He begins with an examination of the communities of the Fijians, the Basutos, and the Dyaks. Among the Fijians there are villages where theoretically all the people are of common descent, and where every family group has its own town lot, subdivided until every household has a lot of its own, which is to be built upon so as to leave a pathway between it and the adjoining lot, and which is sacred against all encroachments. The lands of the village are of three kinds: the town lots, the arable land, and the forest. The arable land is sometimes apportioned in correspondence with the town lots, sometimes occupied indiscriminately, and the forest is used as common property. The Dyaks inhabit communal houses. The Basutos own their lands in common, shares being assigned by the chiefs to the fathers of families to be held by them so long as they occupy them, but to return to the community when that condition is violated. The tribal territory is divided into homestead, arable, and pasture. From these and other considerations he reaches the conclusion that the village community is characteristic of the backward races of the world; that its appearance among the more advanced institutions of civilization is due to survival, not to creation; and that its widespread existence indicates a phase of development through which all progressive races must have passed.

Turning to India, Mr. Gomme points out features in the customs of the non-Aryan hill tribes that appear in the Aryan communities. He then brings to our attention some very important evidence tending to show that the Aryan village community of India was really formed by the intrusion of the pastoral Aryans into existing agricultural communities of different race, the Aryans forming a superior caste supported by the labor of those whom they had conquered, but whose system of economics they did not materially disturb. As it is put by Mr. J. F. Hewitt, a settlement officer who speaks from actual observation, "not only Aryan and semi-Aryan tribes divided the country into townships, peopled and cultivated by associated villagers, but such townships exist also among those, like the Kols and Ooraons of Chota Nagpore, in Western Bengal, who have always hated the Aryans and have never been conquered by them, or subjected to their influence"; and it appears from the example of other communities "in which Dravidians and Aryans confessedly live together, [that] the Aryan village is formed on the lines laid down by Kolarians and Dravidians, and it is only altered in certain details to make it suit with the Aryan ideas of the sanctity and continuity of the family, and of the equal rights of all holding land in the village." As to the particular customs prevailing in these villages, we have space only to say that Mr. Gomme is able to point out similarities to the customs of certain English communities that are almost startling.

The second position maintained by Mr. Gomme is that Mr. Seebohm is not "correct in his opinion that the English village community was reared on the undestroyed and living Romanized land system." The fact that there is much which is not Teutonic or Celtic in the village community as it is found in Britain does not compel us to resort to Roman institutions in explanation, ignoring the possible results of the Aryan conquest of an extensive Iberian population. Certainly the commercialism of Rome seems to have made no enduring impression upon those self-contained villages, the inhabitants of which, in some instances as late as the present century, looked upon all outside of their own boundaries as foreigners. The treatment of the towns by the Anglo-Saxon invaders shows that they did not understand their use, and Mr. Gomme thinks that agricultural settlements were formed in the very outskirts of London. It has been proved that Wales was more thoroughly Romanized than other parts of Britain, and yet it is in Wales that we have the most remarkable evidence of the existence of the tribal community. In fact, Mr. Gomme would maintain that the village communities of Britain were no more affected by Roman influence than those of India have been affected by the rule of the English.

The greater part of the book is devoted to collecting the evidence of comparative custom bearing upon the existence of non-Aryan elements in the English village, the main position of the author being that the institution is a survival from prehistoric times. He considers that the Aryan conquerors of Britain, like the Aryan conquerors of India, met a people whom they did not exterminate, but subjugated, and that there resulted communities exhibiting the customs of both peoples. The pre-Celtic inhabitants were hill-men, and the instances of terrace cultivation and hill-top fortresses are carefully marshalled. It must be said, however, that the argument, so far as it depends upon the evidences of the terraces in England, limps painfully, and that it is saved only by resort to the existing practices of the hill tribes of India. It is strengthened by reference to some archaic customs which, in view of parallels to be found in India, lend support to the theory that two races were represented in the village community. We may instance the many examples of the election of a "mock-Mayor," which Mr. Gomme explains by comparison with similar ceremonies in India, where the non-Aryan castes of the village meet and elect their own leader, with the tolerance for the time of their superiors.

The traces of the existence of the tribal community in Britain, and the surviving examples of the transition to the village community, furnish some evidence confirmatory of Mr. Gomme's theory. Turning to the final type of the village community, of which the manor of Aston and Cote is a remarkable example, Mr. Gomme observes that there is no evidence of Roman occupation, while the successful resistance of the tenants to the claims of the lord of the manor has preserved for us an invaluable illustration of the customs of the archaic community. Here, as in India, we find that some of the villagers were set apart as village servants, and paid out of the village lands, and it had been already noticed by Sir Henry Maine that in some English parishes there are lots in the common field known from time immemorial by the name of a particular trade, and believed to be capable of being owned only by those following that trade. This instance is certainly favorable to the contention that the manor is a comparatively late development, imposed upon a foundation of earlier communal institutions. It seems to be almost unique as evidence, but it is difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here the explanation of the method by which, in thousands of instances, village rights were converted into lord's rights. The bearing of this upon the question of the origin of the manorial courts is obvious.

Upon the whole, Mr. Gomme makes out a case that has strong points, but that is by no means complete. Many of his arguments would apply to the phenomena resulting from a mingling of Teutons with Britons as well as to a mingling of Britons with a preceding race. But we cannot but sympathize with him in his reluctance to adopt Mr. Seebohm's view that the Roman villa is the key with which these chambers of the past are to be unlocked. It seems incredible that the advanced political organization of the Roman Empire should have materially affected villages unreached by roads and buried in forests; and the permanency of traditional customs is to be considered when we find so large a proportion of archaic elements. Mr. Gomme's book suffers a little in its arrangement from his proneness to grasp at arguments as they suggest themselves to his mind, without much regard for continuity. Further study will doubtless enable him not only to strengthen his reasoning, but also to develop his theory in a more orderly fashion.

Fundamental Problems: The Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge. By Dr. Paul Carus. Chicago: The *Open Court* Publishing Company.

A BOOK of newspaper articles on metaphysics, extracted from Chicago's weekly journal of philosophy, the *Open Court*, seems to a New Yorker something singular. But, granted that there is a public with aspirations to understand fundamental problems, the way in which Dr. Carus treats them is not without skill. The questions touched upon are all those which a young person should have turned over in his mind before beginning the serious study of philosophy. The views adopted are, as nearly as possible, the average opinions of thoughtful men to-day—good, ripe doctrines, some of them possibly a little *passées*, but of the fashionable complexion. They are stated with uncompromising vigor; the argumentation does not transcend the capacity of him who runs; and if there be here and there an inconsistency, it only renders the book more suggestive, and adapts it all the better to the need of the public.

The philosophy it advocates is superscientific. "There is no chaos, and never has been a chaos," exclaims the author, although of this no scientific evidence is possible. The doctrine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of "the rigidity of natural laws . . . is a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί." Such expressions are natural to Chicago journalists, yet, emphatic as this is, we soon find the κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί is nothing but a regulative principle, or "plan for a system." When we afterwards read that, "in our opinion, atoms possess spontaneity, or self-motion," we wonder how, if this is anything more than an empty phrase, it comports with rigid regularity of motion.

Like a stanch Lockian, Dr. Carus declares that "the facts of nature are specie, and our abstract thoughts are bills which serve to economize the process of exchange of thought." Yet these bills form so sound a currency that "the highest laws of nature and the formal laws of thought are identical." Nay, "the doctrine of the conservation of matter and energy, although discovered with the assistance of experience, can be proved in its full scope by the pure reason alone." When abstract reason performs such a feat as that, is it only economizing the interchange of thought? There is no tincture of Locke here.

Mathematics is highly commended as a "reliable and well established" science. Riemann's stupendous memoir on the hypotheses of geometry is a "meritorious essay." Newton is "a distinguished scientist." At the same time, the views of modern geometers are correctly rendered: "Space is not a non-entity, but a real property of things."

The profession of the *Open Court* is to make an "effort to conciliate religion with science." Is this wise? Is it not an endeavor to reach a foredetermined conclusion? And is not *that* an anti-scientific, anti-philosophical aim? Does not such a struggle imply a defect of intellectual integrity and tend to undermine the whole moral health? Surely, religion is apt to be compromised by attempts at conciliation. Tell the Czar of all the Russias you will conciliate autocracy with individualism; but do not insult religion by offering to conciliate it with any other impulse or development of human nature whatever. Religion, to be true to itself, should demand the unconditional surrender of free-thinking. Science, true to itself, cannot listen to such a demand for an instant. There may be some possible reconciliation between the religious impulse and the scientific impulse; and no fault can be found with a man for believing himself to be in possession of the solution of the difficulty (except that his reasoning may be inconclusive), or for having faith that such a solution will in time be discovered. But to go about to search out that solution, thereby dragging religion before the tribunal of free thought, and committing philosophy to finding a given proposition true—is this a wise or necessary proceeding? Why should not religion and science seek each a self-development in its own interest, and then if, as they approach completion, they are found to come more and more into accord, will not that be a more satisfactory result than forcibly bending them together now in a way which can only disfigure both? For the present, a religion which believes in itself should not mind what science says; and science is long past caring one fig for the thunder of the theologians.

However, these objections apply mainly to the *Open Court's* profession, scarcely at all to its practice; for a journal cannot be said to wrench philosophy into a forced assent to religion which pronounces that "it is undeniable that immaterial realities cannot exist," and that "the appearance of the phenomena of sensation will be found to depend upon a special form in which the molecules of protoplasma combine and disintegrate," and that "the activity called life is a special kind of energy" (a doctrine whose attractiveness is inversely as one's knowledge of dynamics).

Dr. Carus writes an English style several degrees less unpleasant than that of many of our young compatriots who have imbibed the German taste by some years' or months' residence in Berlin or Heidelberg. And as to consistency, whatever may be its importance in a systematic work, in a series of brief articles designed chiefly to stimulate thought, strictly carried out, it would be no virtue, but rather a fault. On the whole, the *Open Court* is marked by sound and enlightened ideas, and the fact that it can by any means find support does honor to Chicago.

A Dictionary of Applied Chemistry. By T. E. Thorpe, Professor of Chemistry in the Normal School of Science and Royal School of Mines, South Kensington, assisted by eminent contributors. Vol. I. Longmans, Green & Co. 1890.

When, in 1888, the first volume of the revised edition of Watt's 'Dictionary of Chemistry' appeared, under the editorship of Profs. Morley and Muir, it was announced that matters of chemical technology which had occupied considerable space in the former edition would be omitted and form the material of a companion volume to be edited by Prof. Thorpe. The original plan of confining the treatment of technical chemistry to the limits of a single volume has suffered a wise modification, and we are now promised a dictionary of applied chemistry in three volumes. The first of these lies before us. In size, typography, and general appearance it is uniform with the new edition of Watt's Dictionary, making a handsome book of about 700 pages. The text is illustrated by some 230 well-chosen cuts, the most fully illustrated subjects being Analysis, Aspirators, Assaying, Balance, Bleaching, Brewing, Candles, Carbon, Cements, Chlorine, Dextrin, and Distillation. As stated in the preface, the work is designed to be essentially a dictionary of chemistry in its applications to the arts and manufactures. Although in a general sense complementary to Watt's Dictionary, certain titles are of necessity common to both works: thus, such subjects as Atmosphere, Water, Fermentation, Chemistry of the Hydrocarbons, Vegeto-Alkaloids, Glucosides, etc., etc., are included in the plan of this dictionary by reason of their relations to technology or to medicine and sanitation; but in all cases these subjects are treated from the standpoint of practical application.

We are glad to see this separation of subject-matter and treatment. The bounds of chemical knowledge and its application to practical and industrial problems have been, in the last quarter of a century, so extended that the dictionary-makers must divide the field if they are to reach the last of the alphabet before the first volumes of their work become antiquated. And on the same account, in the interest of freshness and timeliness, the plan of succinct treatment adopted in these two dictionaries is to be commended. Concise outlines, if accurate, well up to date, and supplemented by good bibliographies, are worth infinitely more than the distant hope of future voluminously complete discussions. In completeness and thoroughness these dictionaries are not to be compared with the 'Neues Handwörterbuch der Chemie' or the 'Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Technischen Chemie.' But the former, whose first volume bears on its title-page the date 1871, has this year only just completed R; and the latter, in its fourth edition, is engaged with "Fette und Oele" on the 4,585th page from its start with "Aether."

This first volume of the 'Dictionary of Applied Chemistry' closes on the 715th page with Dysodil. Prof. Thorpe has certainly been fortunate in the contributors he has secured for the undertaking. Their names are a sufficient guarantee for the accuracy and value of the work. No one is better fitted to write on ammonia, chlorine, and bromine than Prof. Lunge of Zürich. Prof. Meldola is an unquestioned authority on azo-coloring matters, and Dr. Witt on the azines; and, in general, the thirty whose names appear as contributors to this volume are men specially fitted to write on the subjects assigned to them. No American names are in the list, but the preface leads us to expect contributions from some of our chemists in the succeeding volumes. Some of the most important articles, with the number of pages occupied by each, are: Disinfectants (18) by A. H. Allen; Analysis (57) by C. H. Bothamley; Cellulose (12) by C. F. Cross; Balance (14) and Cyanides (18) by W. Dittmar; Candles (5) by Leopold Field; Cements (27) by W. N. Hartley; Bleaching (13) and Dyeing (13) by J. J. Hummel; Brewing (29) by John Heron; Ammonia (17) and Chlorine (40) by G. Lunge; Azo-Coloring Matters (28) by Raphael Meldola; Alizarin (10) by W. H. Perkin; Albuminoids (7) by H. H. Robinson; Dextrose (8) by Cornelius O'Sullivan; Alcohol and Alcoholometry (11) by G. N. Stoker; Azines (10) by Otto N. Witt; Distillation (9) by Sydney Young.

One could wish that the bibliography of the subjects, so important a matter where the treatment is so condensed, had received closer supervision; for while on the whole the literature is pretty fully given, in a few cases of importance the authors have almost entirely or quite omitted their lists of references. Attention to another point involving little additional labor would have added materially to the completeness of the work and the satisfaction of its users: we refer to the giving of derivations, synonyms, and French and German equivalents of the words which serve as titles. This matter has evidently been left to the discretion of the various contributors, and has led to an annoying lack of uniformity.

But, aside from such comparatively slight blemishes, the work is a model of its kind. It will prove invaluable to the chemist, and to the technologist it will afford exact and useful information in regard to allied industries. To whatever subject the reader may turn, he will find description and statement always clear, well-arranged, fresh, and reliable.

Sketches of War History, 1861–1865. Papers prepared for the Ohio Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States. 1888–1890. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo, pp. 471.

This substantial and attractive volume is the third which has been published by the Ohio Commandery of the Loyal Legion, and is good proof of the interest in historical matters maintained by the organization. Each volume has been an improvement on its predecessor, showing a growing appreciation of the proper character and the true value of personal reminiscences of the civil war. Under the intelligent editing of Capt. Hunter, the Recorder of the Commandery, the present collection is wholly free from padding, every paper being a genuine record of personal knowledge by men who were part of what they relate. Their experiences, as here narrated, range from the battle of Shiloh to Sailor's Creek and Bentonville, and include an interesting account of the politico-military condition of things at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington in the first weeks after the beginning of hostilities, by Mr. A. F. Perry.

Twenty chapters of personal reminiscences of the war are thus added to the valuable material for history which the Loyal Legion has before given to the country. The variety of topics, the vigor of the narratives, and (what might not be looked for) the general excellence of the style of the several writers, combine to make this a book not only of value to the future historian, but of present and often thrilling interest to the general reader.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, Sir F. O. La Confédération Suisse. Édition française par Henry G. Loumyer. Basle: H. Georg.
Adams, W. J. L. The Photographic Instructor. The Scovill & Adams Co.
Arnold, Sir E. The Light of Asia. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Bunyan, J. The Pilgrim's Progress. Boston: Ginn & Co. 35 cents.
Carus, P. The Ethical Problem. Chicago: The *Open Court* Publishing Co.
Chisholm, G. G. Longmans' School Geography for North America. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.25.
Classic Gems of English Literature. 2 vols. Thomas Nelson & Sons. $1.
Conway, M. D. Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne. A. Lovell & Co. 40 cents.
Daudet, A. Numa Roumestan. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. 50 cents.
Lives of English Authors. Thos. Nelson & Sons. $1.
Ward, Rev. J. H. The White Mountains: A Guide to their Interpretation. D. Appleton & Co.
Winchester, Rev. E. Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of Dr. George de Benneville. Germantown, Pa.: Converse Cleaves.
Winter, John S. Dinna Forget. F. F. Lovell & Co. 30 cents.
Wolff, H. Cosmos: Die Weltentwickelung nach monistisch-psychologischen Prinzipien. 2 vols. Leipzig: W. Friedrich.
Wolff, H. W. Rambles in the Black Forest. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.50.
Woods, Katherine P. Metzerott, Shoemaker. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 50 cents.
Worthey, Mrs. The New Continent. Macmillan & Co. $1.50.
Wright, T. W. Text Book of Mechanics. D. Van Nostrand Co.
Yonge, C. M. Cameos from English History. The Rebellion and the Restoration. 7th Series. Macmillan & Co. $1.25.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places..$2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

COWLES *New Studio Building,* 145 Dartmouth St., Boston.

ART SCHOOL

INSTRUCTORS.
ERNEST L. MAJOR, HENRY H. KRITSON,
ABBOTT GRAVES, ANNIE E. RIDDELL,
MERCY A. BAILEY.

The eighth year of a well-established school opens October 1. Superior in equipment and in arrangement for convenience and comfort; modelled after the Parisian Schools. Full Courses in Drawing and Painting, including Still Life and Water Colors. Special attention to Life Studies, Portraiture, and Illustrating. Class in Modelling and Interior Decoration. Begin at any time. For circulars address as above.
F. M. COWLES.

The Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art.

CLASS-ROOMS:

1336 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia.

Thorough instruction in Drawing, Painting, and Modelling, with especial reference to the application of artistic training to practical industrial aims; to Textiles, Pottery, Carving, Moulding, etc.
For circulars and all particulars, address
L. W. MILLER, Principal, at the School.

Virginia Military Institute,
LEXINGTON, VA.

52d Year. State Military, Scientific, and Technical School. Thorough courses in general and applied Chemistry and in Engineering. Confers degree of graduate in Academic Course, also degrees of Bachelor of Science and Civil Engineer in Technical Courses. All expenses, including clothing and incidentals, provided at a rate of $36.00 per month, as an average for the four years, exclusive of outfit. Gen. SCOTT SHIPP, Superintendent.

JUST PUBLISHED.

DIRECTIONAL CALCULUS. Based upon the Methods of Hermann Grassman. By E. W. HYDE, Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cincinnati. 8vo, xii+248 pp. Cloth. By mail, $2.15. Price to Professors and for introduction, $2.00.

DIFFERENTIAL AND INTEGRAL CALCULUS. Method of Rates. By ARTHUR SHERBURNE HARDY, Ph.D., Professor of Mathematics in Dartmouth College. 8vo, xi+239 pp. Cloth. By mail, $1.65. To Professors and for introduction, $1.50.

GINN & COMPANY, Publishers,
BOSTON, NEW YORK, AND CHICAGO.

TO A WRITER COMPETENT TO handle manufacturing, financial, and general statistics for a Southern Manufacturing, Trade and Industrial Journal, a permanent position is offered. Must be a ready writer, and able to rewrite and shape facts, data, etc., which may come to hand. His duties will be those of a general Collaborator and Editor, and if able will be expected finally to go South and take complete control of the make-up of the reading department of the paper. Must be well connected, of medium age, with modern ideas. Address F. ERWIN,
Grand Central Hotel, New York City.

THE NATION.—A BOUND SET, also an unbound set; various vols., both bound and unbound; 25,000 odd numbers. Will buy, sell, or exchange. A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, N. Y. City.

BOOKS IN THE FOREIGN AND ANCIENT LANGUAGES. } Subscription to foreign periodicals, Tauchnitz British Authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLUMES, OR sets of leading and scarce magazines, etc., for sale by H. WILLIAMS, 195 W. 10th St., N. Y.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 5 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

A NOVEL OF OUTDOOR LIFE
In Town and Country Library.

Geoffrey Hampstead.

BY A NEW CANADIAN WRITER,
THOMAS STINSON JARVIS.

12mo. Paper cover, 50 cents.

A novel with a plot which holds the reader's interest. Every lover of outdoor life will welcome the graphic sketches of games at Toronto and yachting adventures on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence.

D. Appleton & Co., Publishers,
1, 3, AND 5 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Jarvis-Conklin
MORTGAGE TRUST CO.
Capital paid up, - $1,500,000.

Only Western mortgage company reporting to and examined by New York State Banking Department.
INVESTMENT SECURITIES.
6% DEBENTURE BONDS,
GUARANTEED MORTGAGES.
MUNICIPAL AND CORPORATION BONDS.
INTEREST ON TIME DEPOSITS.
239 Broadway, - - New York.

LOANS FOR CORPORATIONS AND INDIVIDUAL INVESTORS MADE, BEARING 6%, 7%, and 8%. We deal in MORTGAGE LOANS, COMMERCIAL PAPERS, BANK STOCKS, and MUNICIPAL BONDS. References: National Bank of Kansas City, First National Bank of New York, First National Bank of Chicago, Maverick National Bank of Boston.
MERCANTILE LOAN AND TRUST CO.,
501-503 Delaware St., KANSAS CITY, MO.

CAREFUL INVESTORS,
before placing permanently their funds, will write for
"A FIVE MINUTES' TALK ABOUT RELIABLE INVESTMENT SECURITIES,"
to
HERBERT B. CHURCH, Banker and Broker,
53 Congress St., Boston, Mass.

SPOKANE FALLS.—The most rapidly growing young city in America; railway centre and metropolis of a territory containing 200,000 square miles of mineral, agricultural, and timber resources. Finest water-power in the world. For particulars, including book, 'Spokane Falls Illustrated,' send to
CLOUGH & GRAVES, Fin. Agts., Spokane Falls, Wash.

STATE OF WASHINGTON.

That FAIRHAVEN will be the greatest city on Puget Sound is assured. Substantial improvements and unlimited resources. Fortunes made by investing now. For any information, address GAMWELL & WARNER, Investment Bankers, Fairhaven, Wash.

PORTLAND, OREGON.—Thriftiest City in the United States. Real estate investments giving large returns. Building lots $100, $200, and $300, payable in cash or monthly instalments of $10. Lots are rapidly advancing in value. Send for maps, circulars, and references.
T. A. WOOD,
Portland, Oregon.

GREAT FALLS, MONTANA.—CITY of wonderful resources, immense water power, gold, silver, copper, lead, lumber, coal, iron, cattle, horses, wool, and agriculture. Phenomenal growth. For full particulars address
SECRETARY BOARD OF TRADE,
Great Falls, Mont.

OFFICE OF THE

Atlantic Mutual

INSURANCE COMPANY,

NEW YORK, January 24, 1890.

The Trustees, in conformity to the Charter of the Company, submit the following Statement of its affairs on the 31st of December, 1889:

Premiums on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1889, to 31st December, 1889.....		$4,116,629 40
Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1889.....		1,386,134 87
Total Marine Premiums.....		$5,502,764 27
Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1889, to 31st December, 1889.....		$4,144,943 13
Losses paid during the same period.....	$2,553,606 44	
Returns of Premiums and Expenses.....	$705,937 75	
The Company has the following Assets, viz.:		
United States and State of New York Stock, City, Bank, and other Stocks....		$7,274,315 00
Loans, secured by Stocks and otherwise..		2,084,400 00
Real Estate and Claims due the Company, estimated at.....		1,024,000 00
Premium Notes and Bills Receivable....		1,452,990 24
Cash in Bank.....		271,871 00
Amount.....		$12,107,576 24

Six per cent. interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof or their legal representatives on and after Tuesday, the fourth of February next.

The outstanding certificates of the issue of 1885 will be redeemed and paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the fourth of February next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates to be produced at the time of payment and cancelled.

A dividend of FORTY PER CENT. is declared on the net earned premiums of the Company for the year ending 31st December, 1889, for which certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the 6th of May next.

By order of the Board,
J. H. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

TRUSTEES.

J. D. Jones,	George Bliss,	Anson W. Hard,
W. H. H. Moore,	C. A. Hand,	Isaac Bell,
A. A. Raven,	J. D. Hewlett,	Thomas Maitland,
Jos. H. Chapman,	Chas. P. Burdett,	Ira Bursley,
James Low,	Henry E. Hawley,	James A. Hewlett,
Wm. Sturgis,	Chas. H. Marshall,	George L. Nichols,
Benj. H. Field,	Jas. G. De Forest,	Gustav Amsinck,
Edm'd W. Corlies,	Chas. D. Leverich,	Wm. G. Boulton,
Wm. Degroot,	N. Denton Smith,	R. H. Hoadley.
Wm. H. Webb,	Edw. Floyd-Jones,	Joseph Agostini,
Horace Gray,	George H. Macy,	Geo. W. Campbell.
Wm. E. Dodge,	Lawr'nce Turnure,	Vernon H. Brown,
John L. Riker,	Waldron P. Brown.	

JOHN D. JONES, President.
W. H. H. MOORE, Vice-President.
A. A. RAVEN, 2d Vice-President.

MISSOULA, Garden City of MONTANA. Railroad and manufacturing centre, fine water power, rich agricultural lands, mines, lumber, etc. A prosperous city and rich country. Full particulars, including beautiful book, 'Missoula Illustrated,' sent free upon application to
FAIRCHILD, CORNISH & CO., Missoula, Mont.

TACOMA REALTY.—CHOICE IN- vestments made for non-residents; 25 to 100 per cent. can be realized within next year. Lots from $100 and acreage from $10 upward. Improved property rented now for 10 per cent., beside the increase in city and country properties. Ranches, garden, fruit, hop, farm, iron and coal lands, mining properties. Write
E. F. RUSSELL & CO., Tacoma, Wash.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED